

dered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That it is the sense of the Congress that (1) if Communist China is admitted to membership in the United Nations or (2) if representatives of the Communist regime in China are recognized as the representatives of the Republic of China in the United Nations, the President should recall the representatives of the United States in the United Nations and should take such steps as may be necessary to effect the withdrawal of the United States from membership in the United Nations and all organs and agencies thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the desire of the Senator from California that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, or that they lie on the table?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I desire to have the resolutions referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolutions (S. Res. 112 and S. Con. Res. 29) were received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Owen Clarke, of Washington, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner, vice William J. Patterson, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the desire of the Senator from California that the Executive Calendar be called at this time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Not at this time, Mr. President.

RECESS

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 20, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 19 (legislative day of May 15), 1953:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Owen Clarke, of Washington, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1959, vice William J. Patterson.

XCIX—322

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 19, 1953

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.
Rev. Frank Ray Wilson, St. John's Church, Lafayette Square, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Gracious Father, worthy is it and right for us to offer Thee praise and our humble petition, Thou who art truly God.

Look favorably, we beseech Thee, O Lord, upon the people of this land whom we have been appointed to serve.

Grant unto us in this House, especially, that whereas in many things we may be divided, we may be united in heart and mind to bear the burdens laid upon us.

Help us to respond to the call of our country and the hopes of all men everywhere according to our several powers. Put far from us all selfish indifference to the needs of others. Pour upon us Thy grace to fulfill our daily duties with sober diligence. Keep us from all uncharitableness in word or deed, and enable us by the patient prodding of Thy holy spirit to do all things well, while protecting us from every evil to which we may be exposed.

And may we also ask that when the day is done we may be able to say with an honest and good heart we have sought to do Thy will, O God, and glorified Thy holy name. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 11, 1953:

H. R. 720. An act for the relief of Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery.

On May 13, 1953:

H. R. 1936. An act authorizing the acceptance, for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, of school board land in exchange for park land, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2936. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the State of California for use as a fairground by the 10-A District Agricultural Association, California.

On May 14, 1953:

H. R. 688. An act for the relief of Takako Niina;

H. R. 884. An act for the relief of Stephanie Marie Dorcey;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Aspasia Vezertzi;

H. R. 955. An act for the relief of Paula Akiyama;

H. R. 1186. An act for the relief of Astrid Ingeborg Marquez;

H. R. 1193. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley;

H. R. 1451. An act for the relief of Mrs. James M. Tuten, Jr.;

H. R. 1704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suga Umezaki;

H. R. 1895. An act for the relief of Jack Kamal Samhat;

H. R. 2353. An act for the relief of Ema Shelome Lawter; and

H. R. 2624. An act for the relief of Paola Boezi Langford.

On May 18, 1953:

H. R. 731. An act for the relief of James Renwick Moffett;

H. R. 748. An act for the relief of Anne-liese Else Hermine Ware (nee Neumann); and

H. R. 4004. An act to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 110):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. MERLIN HULL, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution to revise and reprint the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government."

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 239) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That WILLIAM M. TUCK, of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Post Office and Civil Service.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Small Business may have permission to sit during general debate in the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

EDWARD KEATING

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to an event of unusual significance which occurred in Washington recently when a former colleague was honored for outstanding service in the newspaper field. I refer to the retirement of Edward Keating as editor and manager of Labor, a national weekly newspaper owned and edited by the railroad workers of America, at which time Mr. Keating was elected manager emeritus of this publication for life.

Mr. Keating was elected to Congress while a resident of Pueblo, Colo. I have the honor to represent the congressional district in Colorado that he so ably served for three terms, during the period from 1913 to 1919. Before coming to Congress Mr. Keating was engaged in newspaper work in Colorado.

Soon after his retirement from Congress, Ed Keating was employed as the first editor and manager of the new national weekly to be known as Labor. From the fall of 1919 until his retirement in March of this year he directed the editorial policies of this publication, which each Member of Congress receives and enjoys each week.

On the occasion of his retirement several prominent railroad labor leaders paid highly deserved tributes to Mr. Keating for his long, efficient, and valuable service. Mr. Thomas C. Carroll, president of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, had this to say in presenting the resolution which bestowed upon him the title of manager and editor emeritus for life:

To say that Ed Keating has done a magnificent job with our paper, Labor, is understating the facts. I don't think there is a man living who could have done a more splendid job.

It would be impossible to place a monetary value on the good will our paper has brought to the railway workers of this country. As a matter of fact, it may be truthfully said that the work of our newspaper, Labor, has profited all the workers of the North American Continent.

Ed Keating and our paper, Labor, have contributed tremendously to many, many campaigns of importance to our boys—the Railway Labor Act, the Railroad Retirement Act, the union-shop amendment, to mention only three.

The following tribute to Mr. Keating was paid by Mr. George M. Harrison, grand president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, who said:

I appreciate this occasion when I can pay tribute to you, Ed Keating, for a long and valuable period of great service to your fellowmen, and particularly to the railroad workers as the editor of our great newspaper, Labor.

As I look back over the more than 30 years you have spent with Labor and endeavor to recount the blessings which have come to the members of these organizations which own Labor, I feel it is almost impossible to put in words the progress the workers in the railroad industry have made.

A large measure of that progress is indirectly traceable to the influence our newspaper has had on public thinking, and particularly its influence on Members of the Federal Congress, who on many occasions

had the power of decision on legislation which sometimes amounted to life and death for these organizations.

And I think you, Ed Keating, must look back with great satisfaction over this long period of service. You have given of your time and your talents to improve the lot of the average man.

You have helped countless millions of men and women and children whom you have never seen. Through their labor unions they enjoy a better standard of living and thus enjoy a fuller measure of those things they participated in creating.

Mr. D. B. Robertson, president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, paid the following tribute to Mr. Keating:

I have known Ed Keating through all the years he has piloted Labor. We have been intimate friends and comrades in arms. All of the members of our brotherhood have received Labor for many years.

Through all that time Ed Keating has been a tower of strength for all of us in the ranks of railroad labor. He has built up Labor to a position of unrivaled prestige and influence. Under his guidance Labor has been a strong right arm for our brotherhood and all rail unions in their many hard battles for higher wages, better conditions, protective legislation, and innumerable other vital objectives.

Labor stands as an imperishable monument to the genius and devotion of Ed Keating. We all owe a great debt to him.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of this House joins me in congratulating our former colleague, Ed Keating, of Colorado, on his brilliant record in the newspaper field, and for the contribution he has made not only to the railroad brotherhoods but to the cause of organized labor. It gives me great pleasure to extend our very best wishes to Mr. Keating, and to his devoted wife, on the occasion of his retirement. We wish both of them good health and much happiness for many years to come.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

TRANSPORTATION TO VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1730) to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has prepared an amendment setting a termination date on this proposed legislation. In accordance with that understanding I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, whenever he finds such action to be necessary for the efficient conduct of the affairs of the Veterans' Administration, and under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to utilize automotive equipment of the Veterans' Administration, to transport its employees between field stations and nearest adequate public transportation at such reasonable rates of fare for the service furnished as he may establish. All moneys collected as fares from such employees shall be accounted for and shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. The authority herein granted the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be exercised with respect to any station only after determination by the Administrator that existing private and other facilities are not and cannot be rendered adequate by other means, and that its exercise will result in the most efficient method of supplying transportation to the personnel concerned and a proper utilization of transportation facilities.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the present authority for the furnishing of this type of transportation expired on June 30, 1953, and by unanimous direction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: On page 1, line 3, after the word "That", insert "until July 1, 1955."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUE VETERANS' OFFICE IN PHILIPPINES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3884) to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and continue offices in the Republic of the Philippines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, this legislation involves an expenditure of \$1,640,000 annually and thus violates the resolution of the objectors' committee relating to the consideration on the Consent Calendar of bills involving the expenditure of more than \$1 million. It is a good piece of legislation, but I think it should be considered under suspension of the rules or under a rule. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows that that is what is being paid now for the rental of these buildings and facilities in the Philippines. This involves no additional cost to the Federal Government. Some facilities will have to be provided by the State Department if the Veterans' Administration does not do that. I wonder if, in order to facilitate the passage of this bill in the House and get it over to the Senate so it can be passed before

Congress adjourns, the gentleman will not reconsider his request.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I see the point the gentleman from Massachusetts makes. However, the objectors' committee has a rule that if the bill involves an amount in excess of \$1 million we shall ask that it be passed over without prejudice. This violates that rule. I think the bill should come up under a suspension of the rules or under a rule.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then, Mr. Speaker, I suppose I shall have to object to the gentleman's request that the bill be passed over without prejudice, in order to get the bill off the calendar and see if we cannot get it considered more quickly by rule or suspension. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I object, Mr. Speaker.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FORMER LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1026) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

PORT CHICAGO, CALIF., CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2696) to provide a method of paying certain unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of effecting the settlement of those claims against the United States resulting from the explosions which occurred at the naval ammunition depot at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, which have not been settled by the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full settlement of all such claims, the respective sums found to be due in the report of the Secretary of the Navy to Congress dated November 26, 1951, of claims which have been investigated and recommended to be paid by a Board of Investigation of the 12th Naval District subsequent to Public Law 637, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 389): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "report" and insert "reports."

Line 3, strike out "of claims which have been investigated and recommended to be paid by a Board of Investigation of the 12th Naval District subsequent to" and insert "and November 12, 1952, submitted pursuant to."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPOSITION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS COMMISSIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4364) to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries," relative to the composition of claims commissions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the act of Congress of January 2, 1942 (ch. 645, 55 Stat. 880), as amended, is further amended by deleting the words "In time of war" and by capitalizing the next following word "any."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE CHARTER OF THE AMERICAN WAR MOTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1434) to amend the act of February 24, 1925, incorporating the American War Mothers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 7 and 8 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American War Mothers," approved February 24, 1925, as amended (36 U. S. C., secs. 97 and 98), are amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. That the membership of American War Mothers is limited to women, and no woman shall be and become a member of this corporation unless she is a citizen of the United States and unless her son or sons or daughter or daughters of her blood served in the Armed Forces of the United States or of its allies in World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or any subsequent war or conflict involving the United States, having an honorable discharge from such service, or being still in the service.

"Sec. 8. That this organization shall be nonpolitical, nonsectarian, nonpartisan, and nonprofit, and as an organization shall not promote the candidacy of any person seeking public office."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COPYRIGHTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2747) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyright" with respect to the day for taking action when the last day for taking such action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 17, United States Code, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new section 216 to read as follows:

"§ 216. When the day for taking action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday

"When the last day for making any deposit or application, or for paying any fee, or for delivering any other material to the Copyright Office falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday within the District of Columbia, such action may be taken on the next succeeding business day."

Sec. 2. The table of contents of chapter 3 of title 17 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof "216. When the day for taking action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FILING OF CERTAIN CLAIMS UNDER CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1944

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2566) to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to establish a time limitation upon the filing of certain claims thereunder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 17 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 is hereby amended by adding at the end of subsection (d) thereof the following: "No person shall be entitled to recover compensation, to receive a settlement of any alleged obligation, or to obtain the benefit of any amendment, confirmation, ratification, or formalization of any alleged contract or commitment under the provisions of subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d) of this section, unless such person shall, on or before 90 days after the date of enactment of this sentence, have filed a claim therefor with the contracting agency."

Sec. 2. No liability shall accrue by reason of the enactment of the first section of this act which would not otherwise have accrued.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "90 days" and insert "180 days."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMITTING THE STATE OF OHIO INTO THE UNION

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 121) for admitting the State of Ohio into the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. LYLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I have an explanation of this joint resolution? If Ohio is not a member of the Union and we have some illegal Members of the Senate and the House here, I should like to know it. I would like to have an explanation, actually, as to what this joint resolution does.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am no authority on this piece of legislation, but I might advise the gentleman that it is my understanding that the only purpose of this joint resolution is to make fixed and exact the date on which Ohio entered the Union. There is no question that Ohio is in the Union.

Mr. LYLE. I see.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There is some little confusion as to the exact date. This makes the date March 1, 1803.

Mr. LYLE. That clears it up some, because, in view of some of the things that have been said by the gentleman from Ohio, I am sure if they were not in the Union they would not want to subject themselves to many of the things they have been talking about.

I withdraw my reservation of the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas, in pursuance of an act of Congress, passed on the 30th day of April, 1802, entitled "An act to enable the people of the eastern division of the territory northwest of the river Ohio to form a constitution and State government, and for the admission of such State into the Union, on an equal footing with the original States, and for other purposes," the people of the said territory did, on the 29th day of November, 1802, by a convention called for that purpose, form for themselves a constitution and State government, which constitution and State government, so formed is republican, and in conformity to the principles of the articles of compact between the original States and the people and States in the territory northwest of the river Ohio, passed on the 13th day of July, 1787: Therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the State of Ohio, shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and is admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever.

SEC. 2. This joint resolution shall take effect as of March 1, 1803.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR PURCHASE OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR HOME AND OTHER SITES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2512) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the Delegate from Alaska answer a question please with regard to this bill? I note there are not up-to-date reports before the committee on this bill. However, similar bills passed the House in both the 80th and 81st Congresses. I wish to inquire of the gentleman whether or not there were complete reports in the 80th and 81st Congresses on the similar measure which passed the House.

Mr. BARTLETT. There were at that time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended by the act approved July 14, 1945 (59 Stat. 467; 43 U. S. C., sec. 682a), is amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, is authorized to sell or lease to any person or organization described in section 3 of this act a tract of not exceeding 5 acres of any vacant, unreserved public lands, public lands withdrawn by Executive Orders Nos. 6910 of November 26, 1934, and 6964 of February 5, 1935, for classification, or public lands withdrawn or reserved by the Secretary of the Interior for any purposes, which the Secretary may classify as chiefly valuable for residence, recreation, business, or community site purposes, if he finds that such sale or lease of the lands would not unreasonably interfere with the use of water for grazing purposes nor unduly impair the protection of watershed areas, in reasonably compact form and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, at a price to be determined by him, for such use: *Provided*, That no land may be sold hereunder unless it has been surveyed. No person or organization shall be permitted to purchase or lease more than one tract under the provision of this act, except upon a showing of good faith and reasons satisfactory to the Secretary.

"SEC. 2. No tract shall be sold for less than the cost of making any survey necessary to describe properly the land sold. Patents for all tracts purchased under the provisions of this act shall contain a reservation to the United States of the oil, gas, and all other mineral deposits, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable law and such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe.

"SEC. 3. A lease may be issued or a sale made under this act to any of the following: (a) An individual who is a citizen of the United States, or who has filed his declaration of intention to become a citizen as required by the naturalization laws; (b) a partnership or an association, each of the members of which is a citizen of the United States or has filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen; (c) a corporation, including nonprofit corporations, organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State or Territory thereof, and authorized to do business in the State or Territory in which the land is located; (d) a State, Territory, municipality, or other governmental subdivision.

"SEC. 4. Any employee of the Department of the Interior, stationed in Alaska, notwithstanding such employment, may, in the discretion of the Secretary, purchase or lease under this act one tract for residence or recreation purposes in the Territory of Alaska.

"SEC. 5. The authority to lease lands under this act shall extend to the reversioned Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands situated in the State of Oregon and under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 17, following the word "residence", add the following words: "or recreation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the

third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PURCHASE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2312) to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold," is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on June 30, 1953.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this measure about to be repealed is one which I sponsored in the House of Representatives and is one which has worked well. It is heartening to watch the course of this type of legislation and realize that much can be done for American agriculture without the cost of one single penny.

When we had hearings on this matter we found that Europe and parts of Asia were in real need of new materials such as cotton from the United States. We had available this material but we did not feel that we should present it to these conquered countries as a present from the American taxpayer. As a result, we worked out this revolving fund idea. Under the operation of this fund, raw cotton was shipped to occupied areas and was processed by local people, using local labor and mill equipment. It was then sold locally to needy people; and they using current moneys available paid the manufacturer and he in turn paid our people for the cotton used. In this manner, every one benefited from the arrangement.

Under the terms of this bill, millions of bales of southern cotton was thus sold to foreign consumers who otherwise would never have been able to obtain the products needed by them. It has been a successful operation.

TARRANT COUNTY WATER CONTROL AND IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2314) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 certain parcels of land in exchange for other lands and interests therein at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, an identical bill has already been passed by the other body. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1525) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 certain parcels of land in exchange for other lands and interests therein at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex., an identical bill to H. R. 2314 in lieu of said House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in consideration of the conveyance to the United States of America by the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1, of fee simple title to two certain parcels of land and aviation easement rights in other lands described in section 2 hereof, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to convey to the said Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to three parcels of land at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex., comprising an aggregate of two hundred twenty-five and five one-hundredths acres, more or less, and indicated as sections 1, 2, and 3 of area D on Public Works Drawing No. 4847 approved February 10, 1950, a copy of which is on file in the Navy Department, reserving however, to the United States of America, aviation easement rights and such other rights in, to, and over said lands as the Secretary of the Navy may deem proper.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to accept the conveyance to the United States of America by the said Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 of fee simple title to two parcels of land at the said former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex., containing an aggregate area of two hundred forty-four and thirty one-hundredths acres, more or less, and indicated as areas A and B on said Public Works drawing No. 4847, together with perpetual aviation easement rights acceptable to the Secretary of the Navy over other lands of the said district lying in the flight clearance zone of the east-west runway of the said air station.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar bill, H. R. 2314, was laid on the table.

FORT BELVOIR, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2315) to retrocede to the State of Virginia concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Fort Belvoir, Va.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a similar situation exists with regard to this bill. A Senate bill, S. 1549, which is identical to the House bill, has already been passed by the other body. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1549) to retrocede to the State of Virginia concurrent jurisdiction over

certain highways within Fort Belvoir, Va., in lieu of the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the State of Virginia a retrocession of jurisdiction over portions of highways described below within the Fort Belvoir Military Reservation to the extent that all laws of the State and all laws of the United States shall be applicable thereon and the United States and the State shall exercise concurrent jurisdiction thereover: United States Highway No. 1 between the easterly and westerly boundaries of the reservation, Virginia Highway No. 617 from Accotink to the northwesterly boundary of the reservation, Virginia Highway No. 618 between United States Highway No. 1 and Virginia Highway No. 613, Virginia Highway No. 613 from its intersection with Virginia Highway No. 611 (also known as Telegraph Road) to its intersection with Virginia Highway No. 618, and over the following area: Beginning at the intersection of the center lines of Virginia Highway Nos. 613 and 617; thence westerly at right angles to the center line of Highway No. 617, four feet; thence north forty degrees west two hundred thirty-two and forty-seven one-hundredths feet to center of bridge; thence north fifty degrees east forty-four feet to a point in stream; thence south forty degrees east one hundred eighty-eight and forty-seven one-hundredths feet to a point in Highway No. 613; thence south five degrees west sixty-two and twenty-three one-hundredths feet to point of beginning. This legislation is to be effective only as to those portions of the highways and area indicated herein over which the United States has heretofore acquired exclusive jurisdiction and shall not affect portions of such highways and area, if any, over which exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction is now vested in the State of Virginia. The general location of the numbered highways and the bounded area are shown on a map designated: War Department, O. C. E., Construction Division, Real Estate, Fort Belvoir Layout Map, approved September 22, 1944, Drawing No. MAD 37, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army.

SEC. 2. The retrocession of jurisdiction provided for in section 1 of this act shall take effect upon the acceptance thereof by the Legislature of the State of Virginia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 2315, was laid on the table.

SUPPLIES AND SERVICES TO FOREIGN NAVAL VESSELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2317) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain supplies and services to foreign vessels on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill, S. 1524, which has been already passed by the other body is identical to H. R. 2317. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1524) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain supplies and services to foreign naval vessels on a reimbursable basis,

and for other purposes, in lieu of the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to furnish foreign naval vessels at United States ports and naval bases—

(1) routine port services such as pilotage, tugs, garbage removal, line handling, and utilities on a reimbursable basis without an advance of funds when such routine port services are furnished on a like basis to United States naval vessels at ports and naval bases of the country concerned;

(2) miscellaneous supplies such as fuel, provisions, spare parts, and general stores on a reimbursable basis without an advance of funds when a prior agreement conferring reciprocal rights on the United States and covering the reimbursement therefor has been negotiated with the country concerned; and

(3) supplies and services such as overhauling, repairs, and alterations, including the installation of equipment, when funds to cover the estimated cost thereof have been made available in advance.

SEC. 2. Payments for the supplies and services furnished pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of the first section of this act may be credited to current appropriations so as to be available for the same purposes as the appropriation initially charged.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 2317, was laid on the table.

JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN HIGHWAYS IN FORT SILL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4554) to retrocede to the State of Oklahoma concurrent jurisdiction over the right-of-way for United States Highways 62 and 277 within the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an identical Senate bill (S. 1641) which has already passed the Senate, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the State of Oklahoma a retrocession of jurisdiction over that part of the Fort Sill Military Reservation for which permission to use as a highway right-of-way for United States Highways 62 and 277, 80 feet in width, with necessary borrow pits, was granted to the State of Oklahoma by the Assistant Secretary of War by permit dated October 13, 1932. This retrocession of jurisdiction is granted to the extent that all laws of the State and all laws of the United States shall be applicable within the entire area included within the said permit and the United States and the State shall exercise concurrent jurisdiction thereover.

SEC. 2. The retrocession of jurisdiction granted shall be effective upon the acceptance thereof by the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 4554, was laid on the table.

TO AMEND RECREATION ACT OF JUNE 14, 1926

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1815) to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741; 43 U. S. C., sec. 869), entitled "An act to authorize acquisition or use of public lands by States, counties, or municipalities for recreational purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) The Secretary of the Interior upon application filed by a duly qualified applicant under section 2 of this act may, in the manner prescribed by this act, dispose of any public lands to a State, Territory, county, municipality, or other State, Territorial, or Federal instrumentality or political subdivision for any public purposes, or to a nonprofit corporation or nonprofit association for any recreational or any public purpose consistent with its articles of incorporation or other creating authority. Before the land may be disposed of under this act for a purpose other than a recreational purpose, it must be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the land is to be used for an established or definitely proposed project.

"(b) No more than 640 acres may be conveyed to any one grantee in any one calendar year.

"(c) Where the lands have been withdrawn in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency other than the Department of the Interior, or of a State, Territory, county, municipality, water district, or other local governmental subdivision or agency, the Secretary of the Interior may make disposals under this act only with the consent of such Federal department or agency, or of such State, Territory, or local governmental unit. Nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to lands in any national forest, national park, or national monument, or to any Indian lands, or lands set aside or held for the use or benefit of Indians, including lands over which jurisdiction has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for the use of Indians. Nor shall any disposition be made under this act for any use authorized under any other law, except for a use authorized under the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609; 43 U. S. C., sec. 682a), as amended.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may after due consideration as to the power value of the land, whether or not withdrawn therefor, (a) sell such land to the State, Territory, county, or other State, Territorial, or Federal instrumentality or political subdivision in which the lands are situated, or to a nearby municipal corporation in the same State or Territory, for the purpose for which the land has been classified, and conveyances of such land for historic-monument purposes under this subsection shall be made without monetary consideration, while conveyances for any other purpose under this subsection shall be made at 50 percent of the appraised value of the property as determined by the Secretary; (b) lease such land to the State, Territory,

county, or other State, Territorial, or Federal instrumentality or political subdivision in which the lands are situated, or to a nearby municipal corporation in the same State or Territory, for the purpose for which the land has been classified, at a reasonable annual rental, for a period up to 20 years, and, at the discretion of the Secretary, with a privilege of renewal for a like period, or (c) lease such land to a nonprofit corporation or nonprofit association at a reasonable annual rental, for a period up to 20 years, and, at the discretion of the Secretary, with a privilege of renewal for a like period. Each patent or lease so issued shall contain a reservation to the United States of all mineral deposits in the lands conveyed or leased and of the right to mine and remove the same, under applicable laws and regulations to be established by the Secretary. Each lease shall contain a provision for its termination upon a finding by the Secretary that the land has not been used by the lessee for the purpose specified in the lease for such period, not over 5 years, as may be specified in the lease, or that such land or any part thereof is being devoted to another use.

"SEC. 3. Title to lands conveyed by the Government under this act may not be transferred by the grantee or its successor except, with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, to a transferee which would be a qualified grantee under section 2 (a) and subject to the acreage limitation contained in section 1 (b) of this act. A grantee or its successor may not change the use specified in the conveyance to another or additional use except, with the consent of the Secretary, to a use for which such grantee or its successor could obtain a conveyance under this act. If at any time after the lands are conveyed by the Government, the grantee or its successor attempts to transfer title to or control over these lands to another or the lands are devoted to a use other than that for which the lands were conveyed, without the consent of the Secretary, title to the lands shall revert to the United States.

"SEC. 4. The Secretary may authorize transfers of title or changes in use in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of this act with respect to any patent heretofore issued under any act upon application by a patentee qualified to obtain a conveyance under section 2 (a) of this act.

"SEC. 5. The act of September 30, 1890, entitled 'An act to authorize entry of the public lands by incorporated cities and towns for cemetery and park purposes,' and the act of October 17, 1940, entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell or lease for park or recreational purposes, and to sell for cemetery purposes, certain public lands in Alaska,' are hereby repealed."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 10, insert "The Secretary may classify public lands in Alaska for disposition under this act. Lands so classified may not be appropriated under any other public land law unless the Secretary revises such classification or authorizes the disposition of an interest in the lands under other applicable law. If, within 18 months following such classification, no application has been filed for the purpose for which the lands have been so classified, then the Secretary shall restore such lands to appropriation under the applicable public land laws."

Page 3, line 24, strike out "at 50 percent of the appraised value of the property as determined by the Secretary," and insert "at a price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior through appraisal or otherwise, after taking into consideration the purpose for which the lands are to be used."

Page 5, line 15, insert "The provisions of this section, however, shall cease to be in

effect as to any lands patented under this act 25 years after the issuance of patent for such lands."

Page 5, line 22, insert "If the Secretary, pursuant to such an application, authorizes such transfer or use, all reverter provisions and other limitations on transfer or use under this or any other act affecting the lands involved, shall cease to be in effect 25 years after the Secretary authorizes the transfer or use for a changed or additional purpose under the provisions of this section."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND IN JOHNSON CITY, TENN.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1561) authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration in Johnson City, Tenn., to the State of Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill, and also calendar No. 72, which involves the transfer of Federally owned property to communities, without purchase by the communities, seems to be a new policy. I wonder if somebody from the committee might advise us as to what the policy of the committee is in recommending that Federal land be given to communities for specific purposes rather than having the communities purchase the property from the Government.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The policy of the committee is that where there is no objection to it we do. In this instance, as I remember, the land from Ohio was given over to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is Calendar No. 52.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In the case of the Johnson City property it is my understanding this will transfer 30 acres of land that the Veterans' Administration has control over, to the State of Tennessee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is correct. It is to be used for an amusement park and the veterans would receive a great deal of benefit from that. It would be right next door.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. This matter, I may say to the gentleman has had the full consideration of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The Veterans' Administration offers no objection to the approval of this measure and the transferring of title to this land. The tract sought to be transferred is to be used for a recreation park and also for the site of an armory. Therefore, public purposes would be utilized. In the event the tract is not de-

veloped or used for this purpose, then it would be returned to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The only thing, I understand in other communities they will find need for a National Guard building, for instance, and they will go out and buy the property on which to construct it. Here we have a couple of instances at least where, instead of going out and buying the property, Federal property is given to them.

Mr. EVINS. My State of Tennessee gave to the Federal Government a few years ago some 33,000 acres of land for use for an Air Force base. So there is constant interchange of lands for public purposes between the Federal Government and the States. This bill is sponsored by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE], who represents the First District of Tennessee in which Johnson City is situated. It is my information that a similar bill was previously passed in the House in another session of Congress and, as I have indicated, there is no objection by the Veterans' Administration. This land is to be used for park and recreation purposes and the veterans at that facility would gain the advantage of its use.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman believes that in the case of these transfers it should be the policy that where the transfer is for the benefit, in this case, of the Veterans' Administration that it should be made?

Mr. EVINS. I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the Veterans' Administration's interests are protected by a provision that it may be ceded back to the Federal Government if it is not used for the purposes indicated.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Board of Managers who had been managing the Soldiers' Home transferred it to the Veterans' Administration. It was a transfer from one Government agency to another. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] was helpful in securing the passage of the bill. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs was unanimous in voting for this measure—as was the Budget and the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized to transfer to the State of Tennessee certain property of the Veterans' Administration situated in Johnson City, Tenn., and described as follows:

Commencing at a point located on the northwest corner of the property which will be known as corner numbered 1; thence running south two degrees no minutes west one thousand eight hundred fifty and eight-tenths feet to corner numbered 2; thence running south seventy-four degrees fifty-two minutes east six hundred and sixty-nine feet to corner numbered 3; thence running north two degrees no minutes east two thousand two hundred forty and three-tenths feet to corner numbered 4; thence running south seventy-three degrees twenty-five minutes west two hundred fifty-two and three-tenths feet to corner numbered 5; thence running south sixteen degrees thirty-five minutes east twenty feet to corner numbered 6; thence running south seventy-three de-

grees twenty-five minutes west four hundred and thirty-four feet back to corner numbered 1, the origin point of this survey. This land includes approximately thirty and fifty-eight one-hundredths acres, and shall be conveyed together with all buildings, improvements thereon, and all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall execute and deliver in the name of the United States in its behalf any and all contracts, conveyances, or other instruments as may be necessary to effectuate the said transfer: *Provided further,* That there shall be reserved to the United States all minerals, including oil and gas, in the lands authorized for conveyance of this section.

SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain a provision that said property shall be used primarily for training of the National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Tennessee shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and in addition, all improvements made by the State of Tennessee during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 3. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency to exist, and upon the determination by the Secretary of National Defense that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made by the State of Tennessee for the duration of such state of war or other national emergency and upon the cessation thereof plus 6 months said property is to revert to the State of Tennessee: *Provided, however,* That the United States shall have no obligation to restore the property in any way.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, beginning on line 7, strike out down to and including line 13, on page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Approximately 30 acres of land comprising the westerly portion of the Veterans' Administration Center, the exact courses and distances of the perimeter of which shall be determined and approved by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The State of Tennessee shall pay the cost of surveys as may be required by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in determining the required legal description. The land."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO CINCINNATI, OHIO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4730) to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, of certain lands formerly owned by that city.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to convey to the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-

described lots which were conveyed by the city of Cincinnati to the Government of the United States without monetary consideration by deed dated March 14, 1949: Situate in section 14, township 3, fractional range 2, State of Ohio, county of Hamilton, city of Cincinnati, and being all of lots numbered 159 and 178 of the Erkenbrecker Improvement Co.'s third subdivision as recorded in plat book 13, page 42, of the Hamilton County recorder's office.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 3, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain a provision that said property shall be used primarily for the purpose of providing a vehicular entrance to a playground area on a contiguous tract of land, and that, if the city of Cincinnati, Ohio shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and, in addition, all improvements made by the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor: *Provided,* That there shall be reserved to the United States all minerals, including oil and gas, in the lands authorized for conveyance by section 1."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREVENTION OF COLLISIONS AT SEA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2456) to amend the act of October 11, 1951, authorizing the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That rule 9 (e) of section 6 of the act of October 11, 1951 (65 Stat. 406), is amended by striking out the word "traveling" in the first line and inserting in lieu thereof the word "trawling."

SEC. 2. Rule 11 (c) of section 6 of the act of October 11, 1951 (65 Stat. 406), is amended by striking out the word "been" in the second line and inserting in lieu thereof the word "be."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSPECTION OF PLANTS, BOOKS, AND RECORDS OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2313) to continue the effectiveness of the act of March 27, 1942, as extended, relating to the inspection and audit of plants, books, and records of defense contractors, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of March 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 185, 186, ch. 199, secs. 1301-1304), as extended by subsection 1 (a) (2) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (Public Law 450, 82d Cong.), shall remain in full force and effect until 6 months after the

termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2914, 3 C. F. R., 71), notwithstanding any limitation by reference to war of the time during which the powers and authorizations therein granted may be exercised.

With the following committee amendments:

On line 6, following the second comma, insert "as amended."

On page 2, line 4, substitute a comma for the period and add "or until such earlier date as may be provided by the Congress by concurrent resolution or by the President."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIREMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES WHO ARE PAID FROM SPECIAL FUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4091) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to make the exclusion from such act of temporary employees of Congress inapplicable to such employees who are appointed at an annual rate of salary.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of section 3 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, as precedes the colon therein is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The provisions of this act shall not apply to employees of the Senate or the House of Representatives whose employment is temporary or of uncertain duration unless such employees are appointed at an annual rate of salary."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MENOMINEE INDIAN TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2828) to amend the act of Congress of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085), as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085), as amended, is hereby further amended to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the payment from trust funds credited to the Menominee Tribe of Indians pursuant to the determination provided by the act of September 3, 1935, of \$1,500 to each individual member of the Menominee Tribe of Indians on the Menominee tribal rolls as of December 31, 1952: *Provided*, That payments to minors and such members as are receiving welfare assistance through the social-security program or from the Menominee Tribe shall be made pursuant to regulations to be adopted by the Menominee General Council and approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, change the period to a colon and add the words "*Provided further*, That such payments shall be made first from any funds on deposit in the Treasury of the

United States to the credit of the Menominee Indian Tribe drawing interest at the rate of 5 percent, and thereafter from the Menominee judgment fund, symbol 14X7142."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AT OGDENSBURG, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (C. R. 307) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved August 19, 1950, authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the St. Lawrence River, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the city of Ogdensburg, be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 2 years and completed within 4 years from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS RIO GRANDE AT HIDALGO, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1219) authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate international commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge and originally designed approaches thereto across the Rio Grande, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interest of navigation, at or near Hidalgo, Tex., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject further to the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and also subject to the approval of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico to the construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge: *Provided*, That the construction of the bridge herein authorized shall not be undertaken until after an agreement regarding such construction shall have been effected between the Government of the United States and

the Government of the United Mexican States.

Sec. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of Texas needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its originally designed approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes, upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State of Texas.

Sec. 3. The said Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge in accordance with any laws of the State of Texas applicable thereto, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

Sec. 4. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act to any public agency, or to an international bridge authority or commission, is hereby granted to the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, or legal representatives; and any such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission.

Sec. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "provide for military and."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "originally designed."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "*Provided*, That the construction of the bridge herein authorized shall not be undertaken until after an agreement regarding such construction shall have been effected between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Mexican States."

Page 3, line 6, after the word "Texas", insert "or the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4689) to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENTS OF OFFICERS OF THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1528) to continue in effect certain appointments

as officers and as warrant officers of the Army and of the Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That if the appointment as a commissioned officer or warrant officer of any person who is determined, as provided in the Missing Persons Act (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to have been in a status of missing, missing in action, interned, captured, beleaguered, or besieged at any time after June 25, 1950, and before the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2914, 3 CFR 71), would normally terminate before the person holding that appointment is released from active duty, the President is authorized to continue that appointment in effect until that person is released from active duty. On or before the date of his release from active duty, any such person who agrees in writing to have his appointment as a Reserve commissioned officer or a Reserve warrant officer continued in effect for an indefinite term shall be given an indefinite term appointment in lieu of the appointment which he holds at that time.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT CONCERNING DETAILING OF OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1527) to amend section 40b of the National Defense Act, as amended (41 Stat. 759, 777), to remove the limitation upon the detail of officers on the active list for recruiting service and for duty with ROTC units.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 40b of the National Defense Act (41 Stat. 759, 777), as amended, is further amended by striking out so much of the second sentence as reads, "and no officer on the active list shall be detailed for recruiting service or for duty at a school or college, not including schools of the service, where officers on the retired list can be secured who are competent for such duty."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REHABILITATION AND REPAIRING OF PUBLIC AIRPORTS DAMAGED BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 35) to provide for the repair and rehabilitation of public airports damaged by the armed services during the present national emergency, to extend beyond June 30, 1953, the availability of previous appropriations for payment of claims under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in the past the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having jurisdiction over the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments appropriation bill in its various reports and in the bill recently submitted has made violent objection to this particular problem. I see the gentleman from Georgia present, a member of that

subcommittee, and I would like to ask him whether or not that subcommittee would concur in approval of this legislation?

Mr. PRESTON. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that this matter has been up for discussion in our committee on two occasions this year, first when we were considering the first supplemental appropriation bill and later on when the regular bill was up for consideration. The only reason the committee did not put this language in the appropriation bill at that time was that we were not sure how many projects would be in the status of reimbursability. We thought that near the end of the year we could tell more accurately how many local communities that had expended their funds in making repairs but had not been reimbursed under the provisions of the Federal Airport Claims Act would be involved. Certainly this language should be written into law because less than half of the money already appropriated by the Congress has been expended to the local communities that are in the process of doing the work. I discussed this matter with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] recently and he made the statement to me that rather than offer an amendment to the regular appropriation bill when it was up for consideration—the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments appropriation bill—he would at a later date refer the matter to our subcommittee for study in order to determine just what language should be written into the bill. Of course, that would be legislation on an appropriation bill, something I do not favor personally. This is the proper way to do it, that is, by an act brought before the House from a legislative committee. I think it is inevitable that we must adopt this language, either in an appropriation bill or in a bill of this character. This one has already passed the Senate.

Mr. FORD. Would this legislation conform to the policy of the subcommittee of which the gentleman is a member?

Mr. PRESTON. I hesitate to speak for the entire subcommittee because, first of all, I am in the minority. I am sure it reflects the minority views. I am not positive that I would be making an accurate statement if I said it reflected the majority views.

Mr. FORD. Has it been a question that has been almost unanimously approved by the subcommittee in the past, and I suspect probably at the present time? I know the subcommittee has been greatly worried about this situation. In the past they have strong language in their reports and I think they put a cut-off date on the time that these applications could be filed. Because of the subcommittee's interest I could not let this bill go through until I knew what the subcommittee's point of view might be because they deal with funds that come before the Congress so far as these claims are concerned.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. As I understand this legislation, which came out of the Com-

merce Committee, it is merely an authorization for these funds to be appropriated to avoid the often embarrassing situation when a point of order is raised against a legislative provision in an appropriation bill. The hearings before our committee disclosed no opposition to this legislation, and I believe that it was introduced at the request of the interested parties to forestall and avoid difficulty at the time the Committee on Appropriations had the opportunity to act. Now that is my understanding of the situation.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman from Michigan is correct in saying that the committee did establish that date to prevent any future filings. This was a doubtful bill to begin with. I really think it should not have passed the Congress, but since the Congress enacted it, it was left up to the Committee on Appropriations to provide funds. The Senate bill undertook to extend the whole thing so that new applications could be filed, but what the House has done is this: they have stricken the Senate language and simply put a paragraph in the bill saying that the funds shall remain available until expended. This does not provide any future authorization at all. It simply means that the money heretofore appropriated remains available until expended so that the communities currently doing the work can be reimbursed, something that we must do, in fairness, if we are going to treat the communities fairly.

Mr. FORD. It is my understanding then that we are not contemplating at this time approving the Senate bill, which does extend the date. All we are doing is passing the House version. I would object to any approval of the Senate language based on the experience that the gentleman from Georgia and his subcommittee have had which indicated that there was some very loose handling of the approval of these claims. I will withdraw my reservation but I do want to go on record that I will certainly disapprove of any attempt to approve the Senate language.

Mr. DOLLIVER. You will note on page 3 of the report that sections 1, 2, and 3 of the bill as passed by the Senate have been eliminated from the House bill.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Michigan will yield further, I would like to thank him for withdrawing his reservation. I am very much interested in this bill as I have a project in my district which is affected. The city of Colorado Springs is now engaged in the construction of a new administration building to serve the municipal airport. The Federal contribution under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act has been made and the funds allocated to this project. Construction is proceeding as rapidly as possible, but the building cannot be completed by June 30. Assurance has been given that the Federal funds will be available until construction is completed, which will require several additional months. I understand there are other projects over the country in the same situation.

I consider the passage of this bill highly important, so we can keep faith with those who have commenced construction of local airport projects on the assumption that the Federal appropriation would be available until expended. No further appropriation of Federal funds is involved. It is merely a question of giving local communities necessary time to take advantage of appropriations heretofore made for their benefit.

Mr. FORD. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) By deleting the last sentence of subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Appropriations made pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended."

(b) By amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

"TIME LIMITATIONS ON FILING OF REQUESTS"

"(d) No request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport submitted pursuant to this section shall be considered by the Secretary unless such request was submitted to him within 6 months after the occurrence of the damage upon which the request is based, except that in the case of a request relating to damage occurring while the airport was under the control and management of the United States, such request may be submitted to the Secretary within 6 months after the transfer of such control and management of the report to the public agency involved."

(c) By adding thereto a new subsection (e) as follows:

"TIME LIMITATIONS ON MAKING OF CERTIFICATIONS"

"(e) No certification pursuant to this section with respect to a request submitted to the Secretary after the date of enactment of this subsection (except a supplemental certification of the amount by which the actual cost of accomplished rehabilitation or repair exceeds the amount of a prior certification which was based on the estimated cost of such rehabilitation or repair) shall be made to the Congress after a date 1 year from the expiration of the period prescribed by law for the submittal of such request."

SEC. 2. There is hereby repealed the proviso contained in the appropriation to the Department of Commerce, Civil Aeronautics Administration, headed "Claims, Federal Airport Act" in chapter III of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 45, 82d Cong.), reading as follows: "Provided, That no request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport filed under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act shall be considered by the Secretary unless filed prior to July 1, 1951, and the Secretary shall make no certification to Congress after July 1, 1952, of the actual or estimated cost of such rehabilitation or repair."

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the proviso of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, cited in section 2 and the provisions of subsection (d) of section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to consider, pursuant to the said section 17, any request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport, which is submitted to him within 6 months following the effective date of this act, if such request would have met the time requirements of the said subsection (d) had it been filed on some date sub-

sequent to June 30, 1951, and prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding provisions of existing law to the contrary, all appropriations heretofore made to the Department of Commerce, pursuant to certifications made by that Department to the Congress under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, for reimbursement of public agencies for the cost of rehabilitating or repairing public airports damaged by Federal agencies, shall remain available until expended.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding section 17 (c) of the Federal Airport Act or any other provision of existing law, all appropriations heretofore made to the Department of Commerce pursuant to certifications made by that Department to the Congress under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, for reimbursement of public agencies for the cost of rehabilitating or repairing public airports damaged by Federal agencies, shall remain available until expended."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to extend the authority to expend certain funds for the reimbursement of public agencies for the cost of rehabilitating or repairing public airports damaged by Federal agencies."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUE IN EFFECT CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1448) to amend the act of June 25, 1942, relating to the making of photographs and sketches of properties of the Military Establishment, to continue in effect the provisions thereof until 6 months after the present national emergency.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act of June 25, 1942 (56 Stat. 390), as extended by section 1 (a) (11) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (Public Law 450, 82d Cong.) is amended by deleting the words "for the duration of the present war as determined by proclamation of the President" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2914, 3 CFR 1950 Supp., p. 71)."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the parentheses, insert "and as further extended by section 1, Public Law 12, 83d Congress, approved March 31, 1953."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF ARMY-NAVY NURSES ACT OF 1947

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1530) to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment in the grade of first lieutenant of nurses and medical specialists in the Regular Army

and Regular Air Force, and appointment with rank of lieutenant (jg.) of nurses in the Regular Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 (c) of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 42) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Commissioned officers of the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps, and commissioned officers of the Regular Air Force appointed with a view to designation as Air Force nurses, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years. To be eligible for appointment under this subsection a person must be a graduate of a hospital or university training school and a registered nurse and must have the physical and other qualifications prescribed by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force for the appropriate armed force. A person appointed under this subsection shall be appointed in the grade of—

"(1) second lieutenant, if she is not more than 27 years of age on the date of nomination by the President and is not qualified for appointment as a first lieutenant under clause (2); or

"(2) first lieutenant, if she is qualified under regulations issued by the appropriate Secretary and is not more than 30 years of age on the date of nomination by the President.

The maximum ages specified in clauses (1) and (2) are increased by the period of active Federal commissioned service performed after December 31, 1947. However, such an age may not be so increased by more than 5 years."

SEC. 2. Section 102 (c) of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 42) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Commissioned officers of the Regular Army in the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, and commissioned officers of the Regular Air Force appointed with a view to designation as women medical specialists, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years. To be eligible for appointment under this subsection, a person must have the physical and other qualifications prescribed by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force for the appropriate armed force. A person appointed under this subsection shall be appointed in the grade of—

"(1) second lieutenant, if she is not more than 27 years of age on the date of nomination by the President and is not qualified for appointment as a first lieutenant under clause (2); or

"(2) first lieutenant, if she is qualified under regulations issued by the appropriate Secretary and is not more than 30 years of age on the date of nomination by the President.

The maximum ages specified in clauses (1) and (2) are increased by the period of active Federal commissioned service performed after December 31, 1947. However, such an age may not be so increased by more than 5 years."

SEC. 3. Section 204 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 48) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. Except as provided in sections 203 and 211 of this title, appointment to the grade of nurse in the Regular Navy shall be with the rank of ensign or lieutenant (junior grade), and each such appointment shall be subject to revocation by the Secretary of the Navy until such time as the appointee has served under such appointment for 3 years from the date of appointment. Officers whose appointments are so revoked shall be discharged from the service

without advanced pay. Appointees shall be female citizens of the United States who shall have reached the age of 21 years on July 1 of the calendar year in which appointed. No person shall be appointed pursuant to this section until she shall have established her mental, moral, educational, professional, and physical qualifications to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy. A person appointed under this section shall be appointed with the rank of—

"(1) ensign, if she is not more than 27 years of age on the date of nomination by the President and is not qualified for appointment as a Lieutenant (junior grade) under clause (2); or

"(2) Lieutenant (junior grade), if she is qualified under regulations issued by the Secretary of the Navy and is not more than 30 years of age on the date of nomination by the President.

The maximum ages specified in clauses (1) and (2) are increased by the period of active Federal commissioned service performed after December 31, 1947. However, such an age may not be so increased by more than 5 years."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERVICE FLAGS AND SERVICE LAPEL BUTTONS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1546) to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if someone could tell me whether this flag is to be used in combination with the service lapel buttons and what design this flag will bear. I will say to the gentlemen of the committee that I am very much interested as to whether or not this is to be an American flag used in connection with the service lapel button or whether it is a combination representing some of these hybrid international organizations we have.

Mr. JOHNSON. This is only a flag to be hung in the home. The gentleman is old enough to remember that we had service flags in the First World War as well as in World War II.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is speaking of service buttons in connection with these service flags?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes. It is a distinctive button and it is a distinctive flag, also devised by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. GROSS. Will there be a flag on the button?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not know what will be on the button, but I know it will be appropriate.

Mr. GROSS. I just want to be sure of that.

Mr. JOHNSON. I hope that will assure the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of October 17, 1942 (ch. 615; 56 Stat. 796), is hereby amended by striking the words "Secretary of War" wherever they appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Secre-

tary of Defense" and striking the words "the current war" appearing at the end of the first and second sections of the act and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any period of war or hostilities in which the Armed Forces of the United States may be engaged."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS OF CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1547) to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That payment of the cost of transportation (including packing, crating, drayage, and unpacking) of household effects of members of the naval forces, upon release from active duty, from their homes of record to places selected by such members is hereby authorized to be made from current appropriations as may be available for such services and any payments representing the cost of such transportation (including packing, crating, drayage, and unpacking) heretofore made, are ratified and approved: *Provided,* That such transportation shall have been authorized prior to June 13, 1947, pursuant to duly promulgated regulations of the Navy Department: *Provided further,* That the transportation costs authorized to be paid hereunder are limited to the constructive costs of transportation from the last duty stations to the homes of record.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESCRIBING OCCASIONS UPON WHICH THE UNIFORM OF THE ARMED FORCES MAY BE WORN BY PERSONS HONORABLY DISCHARGED THEREFROM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1550) to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 125 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, is further amended by deleting the words "of ceremony" wherever they appear therein and substituting therefor the words "authorized by regulations of the President."

Sec. 2. Section 2 of the act of June 21, 1930 (46 Stat. 793), as amended, is further amended by deleting the words "of ceremony" and substituting therefor the words "authorized by regulations of the President."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the period and insert "issued after prior consultation with the Armed Services Committees of Congress."

At the end of the bill strike out the period and add "issued after prior consultation with the Armed Services Committees of Congress."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and

passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAY OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2226) to repeal the provision of the Act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to pay of civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph under the heading "Emergency Fund, Navy Department" of the Act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended (54 Stat. 383), which reads:

"The Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, is authorized to pay all civilian employees appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States, and in Alaska, from the date of their sailing from the United States until they report for duty to the officer under whom they are to serve, and while returning to the United States by the most direct route and with due expedition, compensation of a rate corresponding to their rate of pay while actually employed." is repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPRODUCTION AND SALE OF COPIES OF OFFICIAL RECORDS OF ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2319) to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective Departments, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are authorized to make and to rent or sell to interested persons, concerns, or institutions, reproductions of the official current records of their respective Departments, including but not limited to, papers, manuscripts, documents, books, photographs, lantern slides, motion picture films, and sound reproductions, consistent with national security as determined under regulations promulgated with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and at such prices and fees (not less than the estimated cost of furnishing such reproductions) as may be prescribed pursuant to such regulations. All proceeds of such sales or rentals shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The term "current records" as used herein means records that are required for use in the current operation and administration of the Department concerned.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "current", insert "public."

Page 2, line 4, after "of", insert "preparation and."

Page 2, line 5, after "reproductions", insert "including reasonable administrative overhead."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, CALIF.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 215) providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 2294) for the relief of the county of Riverside, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 2294) entitled "A bill for the relief of the county of Riverside, Calif.," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF RADIO STATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4557) to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to permits for construction of radio stations.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, That subsection (b) of section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof; and such section 319 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) A permit for construction shall not be required for Government stations, amateur stations, or mobile stations. With respect to stations or classes of stations other than Government stations, amateur stations, mobile stations, and broadcasting stations, the Commission may waive the requirement of a permit for construction if it finds that the public interest, convenience, or necessity would be served thereby: *Provided, however*, That such waiver shall apply only to stations whose construction is begun subsequent to the effective date of the waiver."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4558) to amend section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the time within which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests filed thereunder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth sentence of section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by striking out "fifteen days" and inserting in lieu thereof "thirty days."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CRIMINAL PENALTIES OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4559) to amend section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, so that any offense punishable thereunder, except a second or subsequent offense, shall constitute a misdemeanor rather than a felony.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"GENERAL PENALTY"

"SEC. 501. Any person who willfully and knowingly does or causes or suffers to be done any act, matter, or thing, in this act prohibited or declared to be unlawful, or who willfully and knowingly omits or fails to do any act, matter, or thing in this act required to be done, or willfully and knowingly causes or suffers such omission or failure, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for such offense, for which no penalty (other than a forfeiture) is provided in this act, by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both; except that any person, having been once convicted of an offense punishable under this section, who is subsequently convicted of violating any provision of this act punishable under this section, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 2 years, or both."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2327) to authorize the Post Office Department to designate enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That enlisted personnel of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Air Force of the United States, the United States Marine Corps, and the United States Coast Guard, and the reserve components thereof, may, upon selection by the Secretaries of the departments concerned, be designated by the Post Office Department as Army postal clerks and assistant Army postal clerks, Navy postal clerks, and assistant Navy postal clerks, Air Force postal clerks and assistant Air Force postal clerks, Marine Corps postal clerks and assistant Marine Corps postal clerks, and Coast Guard postal clerks and assistant Coast Guard postal clerks, as appropriate, who shall be authorized to receive and open all pouches and sacks of mail addressed to Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard post offices, stations, vessels, and installations, to make proper deliveries of such mail, to receive matter for transmission in the mails, to receipt for registered matter (keeping an accurate record thereof), to keep and have for sale an adequate supply of postage stamps, to make up and dispatch mails and to perform any other postal duties as may be authorized by the Postmaster General, and in accordance with such rules and

regulations as may be prescribed by the appropriate Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard authority. Each postal clerk or assistant postal clerk mentioned herein shall take the oath of office prescribed for members of the postal service, and shall give bond to the United States in such penal sum as the Postmaster General may deem sufficient for the faithful performance of his duties as such postal clerk or assistant postal clerk: *Provided*, That the Secretary concerned may waive the giving of bond in the case of such postal clerks and assistant postal clerks.

Sec. 2. The Post Office Department shall be reimbursed annually by the department concerned, in an amount of money equal to the funds and the value of other accountable postal stock embezzled by, or lost through the negligence, errors, or defalcations on the part of unbonded postal clerks, unbonded assistant postal clerks, persons acting in those capacities, or commissioned or warrant officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who have been designated custodians of postal effects by the appropriate commanding officer, and funds expended by the Post Office Department in payment of claims arising from negligence, errors, losses, or defalcations by such unbonded postal clerks, assistant postal clerks, persons acting in those capacities, or commissioned or warrant officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who have been designated custodians of postal effects by the appropriate commanding officer.

Sec. 3. Postal clerks and assistant postal clerks appointed under this act, shall be amenable in all respects to the discipline of their respective services, except that, as to their duties as such clerks, the commanding officer having jurisdiction over the post office, station, vessel, or installation at or on which they are stationed, and who exercises jurisdiction over such clerks, shall require them to be governed by the postal laws and regulations of the United States and such supplemental postal directives and regulations as may be prescribed by appropriate authorities. Whenever necessity arises therefore, any assistant postal clerk may be required by the appropriate commanding officer to perform the duties of a postal clerk.

Sec. 4. Any bond given by Army, Navy, or Coast Guard mail clerks or assistant mail clerks or by Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard postal clerks or assistant postal clerks, may be terminated by the Secretary of the department concerned, but such termination shall not affect the liability of any person or surety thereunder for losses or shortages occurring prior to such termination.

Sec. 5. (a) The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Treasury shall take such action as may be available to them to effect recovery of amounts paid under the provisions of this act from the persons responsible for the losses or shortages.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Sec. 6. The act of August 21, 1941 (ch. 392, 55 Stat. 656), as amended by the act of June 30, 1947 (ch. 170, 61 Stat. 211; 39 U. S. C. 138); paragraph 23 of the heading, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, of the act of May 27, 1908 (ch. 206, 35 Stat. 417-418), as amended (39 U. S. C. 134); section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (ch. 389, 37 Stat. 554), as amended (39 U. S. C. 135), and all other laws or parts of laws to the extent that they may be inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following statement in the RECORD at this point.

On April 28 the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, moved to recommit H. R. 4828, the Interior appropriation bill, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 2, strike out all of lines 22, 23, and 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Not to exceed \$3,736,000 shall be available during the current fiscal year from the continuing fund for all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy and for the payment of rentals for the use of transmission facilities."

And on page 3, line 19, strike out "\$38,300,000" and insert "\$42,728,000: *Provided*, That such sum shall include for the following items the respective amounts as follows: "For Snohomish-Kitsap project, \$2,605,000; "For McNary substation, \$1,538,000; "For Ilwaco-Long Beach area service, \$109,000;

"For Valley Way substation addition, \$56,000; and

"For Idaho Panhandle, \$120,000."

The Rayburn motion provided a true test of sentiment on the public-power program. It was supported by those who advocated continued development of low-cost public power for all the people. It was generally opposed by those who favored giving the benefits of public power to the private utilities.

The Rayburn motion was defeated by a vote of 167 to 212. Eighty-six percent of the Democrats voted in favor of low-cost public power, while almost 95 percent of the Republicans voted against the motion and in favor of the private utilities.

It is interesting to note that more than half of the Republican votes in favor of restoring the funds came from Members whose districts were directly affected.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

GRONISLAV VYDAEVICH AND LEONID ZANKOWSKY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1141) for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich and Leonid Zankowsky.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

JOHN W. McBRIDE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 140) for the relief of John W. McBride.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill, S. 140, be passed over without prejudice, and insert at this point in the RECORD the following remarks:

It is my information that when H. R. 834, of which I am the author, was under consideration by the Senate Judiciary Committee, some members thereof stated that they could not approve the bill because they saw no reason for the delay upon the part of the claimant in filing his claim.

I would like to direct the attention of the House to the bill just called, S. 140, which is identical in content with my bill, H. R. 834, as well as S. 365, which the House passed May 5, 1953. The injury sustained by the claimant in S. 140 was in 1943, the injury sustained by the claimant in S. 365 was in 1940. Both of those bills were approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee and passed the Senate. The injury sustained by the claimant in my bill, H. R. 834, was in 1944.

Such inconsistency makes it imperative that I ask that the bill, S. 140, be passed over without prejudice, and I do want the House to understand my reason in so doing.

HARUE FUKUSHI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 978) for the relief of Harue Fukushi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Harue Fukushi, the Japanese fiancée of Robert A. Matza, a citizen of the United States who is serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, and that the said Harue Fukushi shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Harue Fukushi is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Robert A. Matza, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after entry of the said Harue Fukushi, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Harue Fukushi, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent

residence of the said Harue Fukushi as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Harue Fukushi, the fiancée of Robert A. Matza, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Harue Fukushi is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Robert A. Matza and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Harue Fukushi, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 241 and 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Harue Fukushi, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Harue Fukushi as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee."

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of Illinois: On page 3, line 4, strike out "241 and 242" and substitute in lieu thereof "242 and 243."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY FRANCINA MARCONI, FERNANDA GUZZI, ANNA FERRARO, MARY LAUDANO, AND JULIA PISANO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1143) for the relief of Mary Francina Marconi, Fernanda Guzzi, Anna Ferraro, Mary Laudano, and Julia Pisano.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mary Francina Marconi, Fernanda Guzzi, Anna Ferraro, Mary Laudano, and Julia Pisano shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct five numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "immigration and naturalization laws," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On lines 8 and 9, strike out the words "and head taxes."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**MRS. LIANE LIEU AND HER SON,
PETER LIEU**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1330) for the relief of Mrs. Liane Lieu and her son Peter Lieu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Liane Lieu and her son, Peter Lieu, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "immigration and naturalization laws" and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On line 9, strike out the words "and head tax."

On line 9, strike out the word "alien" and substitute "aliens."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLEMINTINA FERRARA ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2160) for the relief of Clemintina Ferrara, Maria Garofalo, Rosetta Savino, Maria Serra, Albina Zamunner, and Fedora Gazzarrini.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Clemintina Ferrara, Maria Garofalo, Rosetta Savino, Maria Serra, Albina Zamunner, and Fedora Gazzarrini, nuns who are at the Malvern Preparatory School, Malvern, Pa., who were admitted into the United States on temporary visas from Rome, Italy, on November 22, 1951, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by them of the required head taxes and visa fees.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct appropriate numbers from the nonpreference category of the proper immigration quota or quotas.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Clemintina Ferrara, Maria Garofalo, Rosetta Savino, Maria Serra, Albina Zamunner, and Fedora Gazzarrini, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for

permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct six numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**LEE KWANG NONG (GEORGE
CLIFFORD ROEDER)**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2392) for the relief of Lee Kwang Nong (George Clifford Roeder).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Lee Kwang Nong (also known as George Clifford Roeder), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Clifford Roeder, citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIE WEIR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4110) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Weir.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws Mrs. Marie Weir shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "immigration and naturalization laws" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On line 7, strike out the words "and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**EUGENE RIVOCHÉ AND MARIE
BARKSKY**

The Clerk called the bill (S. 837) for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent

residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IDA BAGHDASSARIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 779) for the relief of Ida Baghdassarian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ida Baghdassarian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHANNA C. WILLEMSSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 781) for the relief of Johanna C. Willemsen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Johanna C. Willemsen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER CARL SANDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 685) for the relief of Walter Carl Sander.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$3,557.18 to Walter Carl Sander of 2506 Beaumont Street, Green Bay, Wis., in full settlement of any claims against the United States for property loss sustained as a result of a fire on April 14, 1952, while said property was in the custody of the Army and being transported from Fort Lawton, Wash., to Camp McCoy, Wis.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated," strike out the balance of line 5, all of lines 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, down to and

including the word "Wisconsin" and insert "to Warrant Officer (junior grade) Walter Carl Sander, of 2506 Beaumont Street, Green Bay, Wis., the sum of \$3,557.18, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the damages sustained by him on account of damage to and destruction of his household goods by fire, which occurred on April 14, 1952, in a United States Army van, at Camp McCoy, Wis., while said household goods were loaded on such van, for which he has not heretofore been compensated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THEODORE J. HARTUNG AND MRS. ELIZABETH HARTUNG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 783) for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung, of 187 Colvin Street, Rochester, N. Y., in the amount of \$1,200, which was paid Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung as family allowance after the discharge of the said Theodore J. Hartung from the Army of the United States from December 1945 to November 1947, inclusive.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN LAMPROPOULOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1345) for the relief of John Lampropoulos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$500 to John Lampropoulos, of 4228 Archer Avenue, Chicago, Ill., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for bond posted for Tassia Kyriazis (nee Papadopoulos) on November 14, 1947: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR S. ROSICHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3522) for the relief of Arthur S. Rosichan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Arthur S. Rosichan, Buffalo, N. Y., is hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of \$1,935.85, said amount representing sums disbursed by him while he was employed from September 1, 1933, through December 31, 1934, as disbursing agent for the District of Columbia Transient Service of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. In the settlement of the accounts of any officer of the United States or the District of Columbia, full credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 39]

Addonizio	Dorn, N. Y.	Morgan
Albert	Dorn, S. C.	Morrison
Angell	Eberharter	Moulder
Bailey	Fenton	Mumma
Barden	Fine	Murray
Barrett	Fulton	Norblad
Belcher	Gavin	O'Neill
Bentsen	Gordon	Osmer
Blatnik	Graham	Patman
Boland	Granahan	Patten
Bolling	Grant	Pilcher
Bolton,	Green	Poulson
Frances P.	Hagen, Calif.	Powell
Bonin	Harden	Rayburn
Bow	Hébert	Reams
Bray	Heller	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brown, Ohio	Hillelson	Rhodes, Pa.
Brownson	Hoffman, Mich.	Richards
Buchanan	James	Rivers
Bush	Javits	Roberts
Byrne, Pa.	Kearns	Rodino
Canfield	Kee	Roosevelt
Carnahan	Kelley, Pa.	St. George
Carrigg	Kersten, Wis.	Saylor
Case	Kilburn	Scott
Chatham	Kilday	Shafer
Chudoff	King, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, Mo.	Kirwan	Smith, Wis.
Colmer	Klein	Taylor
Corbett	Knox	Teague
Dague	Landrum	Wainwright
Dawson, Ill.	Langham	Walter
Deane	LeCompte	Wheeler
Dingell	McConnell	Wickersham
Dodd	McVey	Wier
Dollinger	Martin, Iowa	Young
Donovan	Miller, Kans.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 319 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

MAXWELL HARDWARE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4048) for the relief of the Maxwell Hardware Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Maxwell Hardware Co., Oakland, Calif., the sum of \$5,015.17, together with interest compounded at the rate of 6 percent per annum from February 1, 1946. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Maxwell Hardware Co. against the United States arising out of the inadvertent overpayment by such company of excess profits taxes for the fiscal year ending January 31, 1946. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, page 1, after the figures, strike out: "together with interest compounded at the rate of 6 percent from February 1, 1946."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRINGTON & GRAHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4432) for the relief of the law firm of Harrington & Graham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the law firm of Harrington & Graham, Washington, D. C., the sum of \$10,600. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of the claim of such firm against the United States for legal services rendered from September 1947 to June 1950 by such firm in connection with the defense of Toneyo Shirakura and Osamu Watanabe, certain Japanese sergeants wrongfully accused, convicted, and sentenced to be hanged as violators of the laws and customs of war by the United States of America: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,600" and insert "\$3,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER LOUISE MARIE JOSEPHINE BELLOIR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 166) for the relief of Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER JEANNE MARIA HENNETH LANGLO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 167) for the relief of Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TONI ANNE SIMMONS (HITOMI URASAKI)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 193) for the relief of Toni Anne Simmons (Hitomi Urasaki).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child Toni Anne Simmons (Hitomi Urasaki) shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Max L. Simmons, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JIMY OKUDA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 207) for the relief of Jimmy Okuda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Jimmy Okuda, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Master Sergeant and Mrs. Melvin C. Nietzel, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGIA ANDREWS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 371) for the relief of Georgia Andrews.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Georgia Andrews, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Gust Andrews, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GIVING RECOGNITION TO THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE OF COL. J. CLAUDE KIMBROUGH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 709) to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Col. J. Claude Kimbrough.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in recognition of the outstanding service and contribution made to the science of medicine and surgery by Col. J. Claude Kimbrough, Medical Corps, United States Army, retired, and to provide that his mature professional judgment and long experience may continue to remain available to the public service, the President is hereby authorized to designate the said Col. J. Claude Kimbrough, upon his retirement from the active list, as consultant in urology at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C. Such designation shall be subject to the said Col. J. Claude Kimbrough's acceptance and shall be terminable at his pleasure, or at the pleasure of the Secretary of the Army. During the time he serves under such designation, the said Col. J. Claude Kimbrough shall be entitled to receive, in lieu of his retired pay, the full active-duty pay and allowances to which he was entitled immediately prior to his retirement.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN CASES IN WHICH THE ATTORNEY GENERAL HAS SUSPENDED DEPORTATION

The Clerk called the resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress

favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

- A-6471827, Angelaras, James George.
- A-7476562, Astwood, Carl Henry alias Carl Brown, Clifford Astwood, Clifford Astford.
- A-6854483, Baarle, Jan Van.
- A-7921576, Babkirk, Cecil Leonard.
- A-9767669, Bari, Abdul.
- A-6451068, Baruela, Carmen Verzola alias Carmen Verzola Benales (nee Carmen Tsucano Verzola).
- A-7445007, Beck, Moises (Mozes).
- A-7903408, Blyden, Ida Louise.
- A-8106368, Boni, Rocco.
- A-6904780, Bose, Peter alias Peter Kaltenberger.
- A-6981483, Botello-Antura, Manuel or Ascension Botello-Antona, or Concepcion Bottella-Antona.
- A-5970209, Bouquet, Jean Pierre Edouard alias Jean Pierre Edouard Chautemps.
- A-7893124, Bourguignon, Paul Henri Joseph.
- A-6379324, Braudo, Abram.
- A-3424978, Bruni, Giuseppe.
- A-5969316, Callwood, Agnes Enez.
- A-7983111, Chang, Kuo Chang.
- A-3474752, Chen, Dora Tseng Fong.
- A-5508435, Chiappane, Rose Margaret (nee O'Neill).
- A-9562048, Chong, Wong or Chong Wong alias Tom Kin or Tam Ken.
- A-3541386, Chruszczyk, Jerry or George Chruszczyk.
- A-7145949, Coleman, Sophie Emma.
- A-8021893, Connor, Zabrina Bethelda.
- A-7390835, Costanzo, Francesco alias James Scotto.
- A-7828206, Crawford, Cristina M. (nee Melly).
- A-4502362, Cruz, Pomposo.
- A-7395423, Csicsery-Ronay, Istvan.
- A-5241207, Daly, Elsie May.
- A-7962046, De Anda-Contreras, Ramon Ramiro.
- A-2875289, De Bandala, Adelina Herrera nee Adelina Herrera-Orvera or Despart or Covarrubias.
- A-3122673, De Frausto, Josefa Gonzalez or Josefa Gonzalez-De La O.
- A-7978997, De Gonzalas, Maria Ana Montoya.
- A-7978918, De Montoya, Maria Ramirez vda.
- A-7980331, Montoya, Victoria.
- A-7873807, Denkins, Constance Carmela.
- A-5673755, Denniston, Carlton Sylvanus or Carlton Sylvanios Denniston, alias "Frenchy".
- A-6425349, De Ramirez, Julia Ortiz or Julia Ortiz-Rodriguez of Julia R. Ortiz.
- A-7139138, De Sousa, Jose Esteves.
- A-7927613, Di Lieto, Joseph.
- A-5567326, Douglas, Miriam Adelia Constantia (nee West).
- A-9567551, Drumo, John.
- A-7539105, Du, Darfoon.
- A-4553438, Dutchak, Semen Nicol alias Sam Nicol Dutchak and Frank Hoffman.
- A-7249128, Eerenberg, Grietje (nee Huizenga).
- A-7203900, Eerenberg, Johannes.
- A-5860280, Ehler, Antone Frederick.
- A-6626042, Eleazarian, Anahide Boudjikianian.
- A-8039483, Felix-Avila, Pedro or Juan Sanchez.
- A-7023558, Fernandez-Parada, Consuelo Armida.
- A-7457597, Fleischner, Kurt.
- A-6989467, Flores-Limon, Macario.
- A-7983045, Forbes, Verna Herodia.
- A-4657800, Frazer, Luther Daniel or Luther Daniel Fraser or Luther Fraser or Louis Frazer.
- A-4717221, Furnari, Mary Frances.
- A-4539679, Caputo, Antonia Frances Helen.
- A-8106620, Gallo, Antonio or Antonio Domenico Mario Gallo.
- A-3745514, Garcia, Manuel.
- A-7962512, Garcia-Jaime, Secundino.
- A-7130995, Garza, Francisco Benavides.

A-6819093, Ghazi, Ibrahim Moses or Abraham Moses Ghazi.
 A-3591839, Graf, Ludwig or Louis Graf.
 A-6938849, Gravitsky, Catherine alias Catherine Ulrich.
 A-6097876, Gushi, Chiru Gushiken.
 A-5981991, Gushi, Koshin.
 A-5966555, Guth, Dora Kathleen.
 A-4132492, Gutierrez-Lavorico, Rosa.
 A-9757521, Haw, Tek King.
 A-3456258, Hayashi, Toshiko or Toshiko Tani Hayashi.
 A-1660305, Heinzie, William Eleasar.
 A-8106367, Hernandez-Borja, Carlos.
 A-7849795, Heron, Victor Joseph.
 A-6315638, Holtzman, Andree Francoise (nee Le Mentec).
 A-7390566, Il-Begi, Tajl Motamedi.
 A-1339705, Jacques, Gerardus.
 A-7677448, Jankowska, Maria or Maria Stawska.
 A-7356278, Jankowski, Sylwim.
 A-7055678, Kaainoni, Leopoldine Maria Forjan.
 A-4544710, Katz, Samuel alias (first names): David, Samuel D., Samuel Samuel David, David Samuel; (last names): Goldchecker, Goldseker, Goldchecker, Goldsecker, Golsecker.
 A-7802020, Klapp, Margarete Karolina Suzanne Magdalene alias Gretl Klapp.
 A-4773382, Kovalink, Mary (nee Tkachuk).
 A-2636329, Kyriacatos, Christ N.
 A-8091971, Lavie, Laetitia Afivor Hiamabe.
 A-9069826, Lee Fai.
 A-3401031, Leuci, Josephine (nee Salvemini alias Angela Basso).
 A-7821878, Liddell, David Francis.
 A-7707784, Limon, Maria Fernandez y.
 A-7759995, Lin, Kuo-Yung.
 A-6703347, Lin, Florence Shen or Pung-Hwa Shen.
 A-6898301, Liu, Wei Kung.
 A-9686023, Look, Pong alias Pang Jung.
 A-5849282, Lumbantobing, Muara.
 A-7247958, Macias-Hernandez, Zenon.
 A-4627136, Martinoff, Sophie Vladimir formerly (Kovalevsky, formerly Blagoy formerly Golikova (nee Daftergoff)).
 A-7050100, Mata, Reyes.
 A-9532298, Mathiesen, Wollfert.
 A-4011396, McLaughlin, Margaret Jane (nee O'Shea).
 A-5487436, Meier, Constance Mary alias Mrs. F. W. Meier.
 A-2101785, Miyagishima, Katsugoro.
 A-4502949, Miyashita, Nobuichi or Jim Miyashita.
 A-2595310, Modl, Richard.
 A-3890186, Monteiro, Jose Maria.
 A-8106350, Moreno, Raquel Cordova.
 A-8091152, Morgan, Mildred Lillian (nee Lewis).
 A-6149807, Munsie, Margaret Alice.
 A-7945035, Musella, Pasquale.
 A-5155465, Nakayama, Tomojiro.
 A-4525627, Nakayama, Masako.
 A-7903015, Navarro-Ornelas, Jose.
 A-6961608, Ngun, Kong Tsao or Katherine Kong formerly Tsao Ngun Woolridge.
 A-5461589, O'Connor, Marie.
 A-8106496, Orlove, Gregor Boris.
 A-8106491, Palma, Francisco De Sousa Romeiras alias Frank Santos.
 A-8091736, Pamela, Jose Senoa.
 A-3564917, Pesole, Nicola.
 A-7941829, Pimentel-Palacios, Lorenzo.
 A-7927525, Ramirez Sebastian.
 A-7197620, Ricciardella, Felice alias Philip Ricciardella.
 A-2080844, Robinson, Lawrence Robert.
 A-5301630, Robledo-Guajardo, Pedro.
 A-5571122, Runge, Frederick Wilhelm Arthur or Friedrich Runge or Friedrich W. Runge of Friedrich Wilhelm Arthur Runge.
 A-6423124, Sabbah, Edgard Moussa.
 A-6685257, Sanchez, Salvador or Salvador Gopar-Sanchez.
 A-1091331, Sandqval-Barrientos, Eulallo.
 A-6816890, Sekros, Sofia or Sekropoulos.
 A-6817370, Sekros, Efterpi.

A-6590225, Serbeniades, Vasilios Dimitrois.
 A-1282934, Shirae, Shinzo.
 A-6377708, Siegel, Hazel Keitha Ashley.
 A-2956945, Simpson, John MacLaurin alias John MacLaurin.
 A-6723494, Spotorno, Giuseppe.
 A-5946348, Sun, Wong (Sang).
 A-6147036, Sutter, Doris Lucille.
 A-6147037, Sutter, Harry John.
 A-9776880, Szewec, Teodor.
 A-7000271, Taylor, Herbert Robert or Herbert Robert Gillespie.
 A-5998831, Torres, Rodolfo Valencia.
 A-5443687, Touma, Nahima (Norma).
 A-6628906, Vafiadis, Konstantine Daniel.
 A-6628909, Vafiadis, Ekaterina Ellena.
 A-9624272, Valk, Cornelius William or William Valk.
 A-5818944, Vernice, Vito.
 A-8091058, Waage, Solveig, Johannessen.
 A-2536887, Wang, Joseph En-Pao.
 A-5871669, Weber, Heinrich Ignatz alias Henry Weber.
 A-7910008, Wenckheim, Beatrice Mary or Beata Wenckheim.
 A-7353077, Wexler, Jeanette or Jeanette Moser.
 A-1331075, William, George Kapa.
 A-5741883, Williamson, Robert or Robert T. Williamson.
 A-5281604, Willison, Margaret Rose.
 A-6924621, Wood, Valerie Laverne (nee Hamilton).
 A-4354547, Yglesias, Remedios Vasquez (nee Perez).
 A-4715237, Yruegas-Bueno, Raymundo, or Raymundo Yruegas, or Raymundo Yruegas-Bueno.
 A-3894324, Zinnamosca, Joseph Anthony.
 A-6355233, Zulueta, Enrique Costa.
 A-2858251, Amzqua, Donato.
 A-2384429, Andrade, Aniba, or Hanibal De Andrade.
 A-9767603, Andresen, Ragnar.
 A-6984215, Andruchow, Peter, or Peter Andy.
 A-7131569, Asymkos, Johanna, nee Frentzos, or Ioanna George Frentzos.
 A-6613791, Baillie, Sophie Margarethe.
 A-5447673, Baptista, Manuel Gomes, or Manuel Gomes Batista.
 A-5540288, Barbulescu, Arghir Juan, or Bob Barbulescu.
 A-7828698, Baublis, Mary, nee Vizaimiskiute.
 A-6172608, Bautista, Antonio Marquez.
 A-6172609, Bautista, Antonio Molin.
 A-6604116, Belmonte, Fidencia Alvarado.
 A-9836641, Bergersen, Else Berit.
 A-1716162, Biber, Hugo.
 A-6390963, Bochner, Moses.
 A-2834288, Boshier, Laura Annie.
 A-7131924, Capua, Dioscoro.
 A-7756316, Cardenas-Lalinde, Luis Eduardo, or Luis E. Cardenas.
 A-6522838, Chen, Chi Hsin, or Chi Hsin Chow.
 A-6451980, Chen, Fu Liem Franklin, or Fu Liem Chen.
 A-8010634, Chinnery, Harold Henrique.
 A-7971824, Choo, Sa Sik, or Sa Sik Eun Bong Lee Choo.
 A-7879888, Choo-Chew, Chang, or Chiu Chiu Chang.
 A-7879887, Ling, Chang Loo (nee Hang Loo Ling).
 A-7858998, Chu, Ming, or Chu Ming.
 A-5263138, Chu, Yong Chen, or Chu-Yong-Chen or Joseph Paul Chu.
 A-7035759, Cortez, Miguel Jose Juan.
 A-3590687, Cottakis, Nicholas Leonidas.
 A-7127831, Coussis, Theodore John.
 A-7394774, Currie, Olga May Campbell, or Olga May Currie (nee Campbell).
 A-7356548, D'Alfonso, Yolanda, or Yolanda Zanfrisco, or Yolanda Zanfrisco, or Yolanda Mazzeia.
 A-6554691, De Banuchi, Esperanza Cruz.
 A-5816898, De Cortez, Juana Anica Aragon.
 A-2924399, Dedousis, Anthony, or Papadoupulis.
 A-1955451, De Florio, Angelina Macias.

A-2732596, De Hernandez, Florentina Cardenas Murillo or Flora Murrillo de Hernandez.
 A-9698428, Delen, Borje Kuno.
 A-6044903, De Leon, Rosa Prudencia.
 A-6877285, De Lopez, Carmen Lopez or Carmen Lopez vda de Chavez or Juana Lopez or Carmela Lopez.
 A-6877277, Chavez-Lopez, Maria Rita or Maria Rita Chavez-Lopez.
 A-7188338, De Salazar, Lorenza Guzman or Lorenza Guzman S.
 A-4724593, De Self, Mary Louise Nava or Maria Luisa Avelar.
 A-6295509, De Vito, Stella Marie.
 A-3998273, De Yanez, Josefa Avelar.
 A-8082378, Diakostamatis, Michael or Michael Thomas.
 A-9620397, Diakoyanis, Stamatios Georgios.
 A-3064690, Dilullo, Dominic Antonio.
 A-2859923, Dong, Ruby Lee (nee Ruby Lee Joe or Shew Guey Jew).
 A-7890880, Duarte, Rafael Argentino.
 A-7119155, Dudley, Ella (nee Stopard).
 A-2830750, Edwards, Reginald Stanley.
 A-7054330, Eskildsen, Edward Carl.
 A-2365566, Evans, Edra Varona.
 A-6515700, Farrant, Laurence Geoffrey.
 A-7983049, Filoteo, Gennaro.
 A-4845245, Fleischer, Martin Andreas.
 A-4007904, Frangakis, Ioannis or John or James Andre Frangakis or John Andre Frages.
 A-1000369, Franz-Josef of Austria, Archduke or Prince Don Francisco-Jose De Habsburgo Y Borbon or Francisco-Jose De Habsburgo Borbon.
 A-1410440, Borbon, Princess Martha De Habsburgo or Marta De Habsburgo Borbon nee Marta Beumer Locatelli.
 A-5101358, Friedman, David.
 A-3625157, Fujino, Chuji (Chester).
 A-6644479, Gagliardi, Giuseppina Gasdia.
 A-7188303, Garcia-Larios, Juan Angel.
 A-7140534, Gawe, Wladyslaw Jan or John Gavel or Walter Gawe.
 A-2263835, Giacalone, Ignazio or Joseph Giacalone or Joe Giacalone.
 A-6819623, Giordano, Vincenzo.
 A-9025886, Glavan, Mijo Mate.
 A-9715436, Gonzalez, Hermino Castillo.
 A-7423227, Gonzalez, Josefa Garcia de.
 A-6063722, Gonzalez-Hernandez, Galdino.
 A-6200611, Goseco, Francisco Navarro.
 A-6207837, Goseco, Nenita Bradley.
 A-6207839, Goseco, Elizabeth Bradley.
 A-6207838, Goseco, Margarita Bradley.
 A-7284919, Gotsis, Theoni Athanaslou or Theoni Athanaslou Barlos.
 A-7137743, Gradillas-Calsada, Jesus.
 A-7290364, Gradillas-Gradillas, Jesus.
 A-7290365, Gradillas-Gradillas, Domingo.
 A-7290366, Gradillas-Gradillas, Eduardo.
 A-6920657, Grant, Frederick William alias Lenord Grant.
 A-4684021, Grimmesey, Satoye alias Satoye Itagaki alias Kay Grimmesey.
 A-8021475, Hachisuka, Masako.
 A-6345097, Hansen, Vivienne Kathleen (nee Smith).
 A-1478191, Hattori, Tadashi or Frank Hattori.
 A-7079560, Henriksen, Corina Kyllingmark or Corina Kyllingmark.
 A-3436032, Heron, Edward Peter.
 A-7981944, Hjort, Paul Konrad Thorvald or Paul Hoyt to Paul Thorvald Konrad Hjort or Paul Konrad Thorvald Hjort or P. Hoyt or Paul Konrad T. Hjort or Paul Konrad Thorvald Tjorst or Paul Hjort.
 A-7197027, Holguin, Gregoria or Gregoria Holguin De Godfrey or Georgia H. Godfrey.
 A-4963380, Horshan, Bruno Hugo.
 A-6847799, Huang, Pao Chyuan or Pao-Chyuan Huang.
 A-6958638, Huang, Shao Chen (nee Shao Chen Wu or Shao-Shen Wu).
 A-2470346, Iman, James or Mohammed Bin Abdullah.
 A-6670228, Ingdal, John Andreas.
 A-7423243, Jarrett, Adriel.

- A-5605706, Johnson, Eveline Mary formerly Larr (nee Lauria).
 A-5602270, Kalafatic, Gregory or George or Grgo Kalafatic.
 A-1823997, Kanakakos, Panagiotis alias Peter Kanakos or Panos Kanakakos.
 A-3196587, Karanas, John or Ioannis Teodoro.
 A-1719629, Karavidas, Petros or Peter Nicholas Papas or Petros Pappos or Pete Pappas.
 A-6581692, Kasparian, Minas or Arnak Minas Kasparian.
 A-1883332, Kennedy, John.
 A-1381848, Kershaw, Frederick.
 A-5792320, Kershaw, Ann.
 A-6680602, Kettler, Geoula Rachel.
 A-7284987, Krause, Luciana Ansaldo (nee Ansaldo).
 A-9769909, Kristoffersen, Osvald Meier or Osvald Kristoffersen or Osvald M. Kristofferson, Oswald Kristoffersen.
 A-6811608, Kulikov, Laura (nee Samoyloff).
 A-8031133, Kim, Young Ja (nee Kwon).
 A-5575162, Langlais, Mary Frances or Mary F. Langlais.
 A-5464805, Langlais, Pascaline Maud.
 A-7130594, Lassince, George.
 A-7115976, Lattyak, Ellen Marianne formerly Ellen Marianne Herdan.
 A-8117167, Lekic, Maria (nee Huper).
 1600-99344, Levine, Dianne Lee.
 0300-344955, Lewis, John or Babun.
 A-5901797, Lung, Vincent Leslie or Eng Hong Doon.
 A-7858241, Malorano, Francesco or Frank Malorano.
 A-3761454, Malik, Abdul.
 A-7862064, Maloberti, Irma.
 A-7280460, Margules, Esther or Eseyera Frydman or Esther Frydman Ackerman.
 A-7445691, Martinez, Domingo (Sunny).
 A-7390663, Martinez, Martin.
 A-3010001, Mastrantonio, Ignazio.
 A-1988773, Matsuo, Shigeru.
 A-6721172, May, Mon Tin alias Mon Tin.
 A-6097030, Melendez, Elsie Egea.
 A-6525483, Mendoza-Trujillo, Jose.
 A-6802547, Miguel, Francisco San.
 A-3356136, Mistretta, Vito.
 A-7058329, Mitchell, Marie.
 Maggia.
 A-5173117, Moggia, Arideo alias Arideo.
 A-6918512, Molocea, Eugene.
 A-6918513, Molocea, George or Gheorghe.
 A-7019900, Moulas, Elaine Gust formerly Helen Moulas.
 A-6888048, Moustafa, Hussein Kamel.
 A-7366691, Murray, Helen alias Helen Clanin.
 A-4706795, Mustafa, Mohamed.
 A-4706775, Mustafa, Dina Merita.
 A-7828672, Mustafa, Lillian.
 A-6492414, Naboa, Patrocino P. Navidad.
 A-4518091, Naboa, Roy.
 A-7290839, Nenna, Vito.
 O-5977617, Noguni, Kame.
 A-6240780, Neely, Antoinette.
 A-7203934, Ocaranza, Aurelia.
 A-7203935, Cortez, Angelina.
 A-70920168, Ortegon, Pablo or Pablo Ortegon-Dominguez.
 A-2509077, Ozdemir, Orham Sakir.
 A-4968317, Pagan, Virginia Felix or Virginia Felix.
 A-7145867, Parrilla, Josefa.
 A-5444738, Peel, Amparo or Amparo Perez.
 A-3818102, Pesce, Paul Anthony alias Antonio Pesce alias Paul Pesce.
 A-6811855, Pestic, Prospero.
 A-4988608, Pettersson, Allgot.
 A-5943396, Pissarski, Joseph.
 A-7116336, Ponitkoff, George V.
 A-7116337, Ponitkoff, Vadim V.
 A-7044542, Posen, Ibolya (nee Endzweig).
 A-9831052, Primavera, Tommaso or Tommaso Primavera.
 A-7145943, Prisciandaro, Damano.
 A-7387859, Procaccio, Michele.
 A-3498519, Pullai, Armand or Armugam Pullai.
 A-7955664, Pyman, Ada Gertrude (nee Terry).
 A-8091703, Rainey, Margaret Amy formerly Sudbury (nee Wittingham).
 A-5295100, Ramirez, Jose.
 A-5988032, Ramirez, Manuel or Manuel Ramirez Canuta Sicon.
 A-7717576, Reel, Virginia Pauline (nee Hulsman).
 A-7927929, Reimer, Mary or Mary Fowler or Mary Farrelly.
 A-4513345, Revello, Antelo Arthur or Anbello Revello.
 A-1131359, Rose, Christian, Heinrich or Carl Rose.
 A-2572993, Rossi, Marie Anna.
 A-3743323, Russomanno, Nicola.
 A-3205205, Sabo, Samuel Ivon, Jr.
 A-6371788, Salinas-Martinez, Jose Emigdio.
 A-6881658, Sarian, Jirair Nerse.
 A-7082564, Sasso, Flora Erma or Flora Erma Rizzi or Erminia Domenica Bonini.
 A-8021832, Saunders, Mabel (nee Mabel Benjamin alias Eugenie Prince).
 A-7280051, Schaufinger, Klaus Dieter or Bobby Bishop.
 A-6178370, Schermerhorn, Paulina Maligos.
 A-2491132, Schlei, Peter.
 A-2491126, Schlei, Susan (nee Suzan Muller).
 A-1219097, Sciancalepore, Giammaria alias John Sciancalepore.
 A-2592388, Scicluna, Anna.
 A-6985470, Shaham, Nevart (nee Asiroglu or Ashroglu).
 A-2727483, Shimizu, Hideaki.
 A-4404619, Sikora, Mary alias Mary Shmura.
 A-5600476, Singh, Jawala.
 0502-6163, Sipsis, George alias George Callins.
 A-6848763, Smith, Maria Carmen.
 A-9825453, Socolich, John Anthony.
 A-5127063, Steel, Joseph William.
 A-3520552, Steinlauf, Eduard Elieser.
 A-6791514, Strahammer, Josef Vincent.
 A-5552117, Takizawa, Kichiro or Kenny Takizawa.
 A-4116938, Tana, Antonio or Anthony Tario or Julio Tario or Julian Farrio.
 A-4209592, Tana, Lucia Molino.
 A-6609640, Tavarides, Cortesis Vassilios.
 A-7388957, Torres, Joaquin.
 A-7388958, Torres, Jesus Manuel.
 A-7388959, Torres, Socorro.
 A-7388960, Torres, Ruben Narciso.
 A-8091254, Towles, Katherine.
 A-7491336, Ulrich, Patricia.
 A-7995810, Vaca-Reyes, Miguel.
 A-6487513, Vartanyan, Hayik or Haig Vartanyan.
 A-5832901, Vela-Garza, Rufino.
 A-4235815, Vela-Garza, Jesusa.
 A-4235816, Vela-Garza, Santos.
 A-9732674, Visser, Adolph.
 A-9579878, Vrolyk, Jan Zier.
 A-6524277, Weinberger, Chaim Hersh.
 A582983, Weiss, Arnold or Irving Weiss or Weist alias User.
 A-8021437, Willard, Cherie Eugenie formerly Kemp.
 A-8117016, Wilmot, Noel Eaton alias Samuel Lowe.
 A-4528159, Wollion, John or John Walian.
 A-5951210, You Chen Tuck or Chang Tuck You or Chenk Tuck You.
 A-4794527, Young, Chee Dick alias Clarence Chee Dick Young.
 A-4120628, Young, Frank alias Tien Fu Yang.
 A-6291236, Zahawi, Faizi Khalid.
 A-6374953, Zahawi, Sevim Miral.
 A-7034695, Zeld, Larry.
 A-2353697, Zimmel, Leon or Leon Semel or Leon Seml Leibisch or Leon Semmel.
 A-6738148, Zielinski, Claudia (nee Dombrovski).
 A-7469542, Balaba, Daniel.
 A-1472027, Berndt, Heinz Werner.
 A-7898442, Blagrove, Archibald Nathan or Nathan Blagrove.
 A-7073695, Bollino, Savino or Babino or Bollino or Bellino Savino or Savaino or Sabino Bellino.
 A-2752500, Bonclich, Sam.
 A-2411018, Calderon, Jesus Alejandre.
 0300/394666, Calero, Gladys or Gladys Milagra Negrin-Rodriguez.
 0300/394667, Calero, Isabel or Isabel Negrin-Rodriguez.
 A-3377743, Camia, Bonfiglio or Phil Camia or Giacomo-Cavana.
 A-7132987, Chu, Edith Ju-Hwa or Edith Tseng-Chun Chu or Edith Ju-Hwa.
 A-7457602, Chu, Tseng-Chun.
 A-7025727, Chung, Jack.
 V-1240753, Dadaian, Serabi Adour (nee Kakhian).
 A-2555368, De Ramirez, Ernestina Escobar or Ernestina Ramirez or Ernestina Escobar Ad Echevarria.
 A-9692102, De (or Do) Rosario, Joaquin Francisco Lopes or Joaquin Rosario or Roasario; Joaquin Francisco Lopes Rosario; Joaquin Maria Francisco; Joaquin Maria Francisco Rosario; Joaquin Francisco De Rosario or Derosario; Joaquin Rosario; Joaquin Rosario; Joaquin or Joaquin Francisco Rosario; Joaquin F. Rosario; Joaquin De Rosario.
 1700-5241, Dolor, Rosalia Ea (Estefania Ea).
 A-7975641, Donovan, Ione Orilda.
 A-3449690, Dwyer, Michael Francis.
 A-7351273, Eng, Frank Gee or Ng Fong.
 A-5394243, Enlow, Julia Irene.
 A-6912654, Fiore, Marie Louise (nee Williams formerly Horton).
 A-5960623, Flanagan, Ursel Renate Meyer (nee Ursel Renate Meyer).
 A-7070741, Flores, Maria Teresa.
 0300-311750, Fong, Eng Lun or Hoy Yin.
 A-2582238, Garcia, Amancia or Amancia Hernandez.
 A-6574522, Garcia, Andrew Winant.
 A-2469265, Garcia, Eduardo or Eduardo Garcia Ris or Viriato Gutierrez.
 A-4705880, Gardella, Giuseppe alias Carlos Alonso.
 A-6825202, Gergits, Hannelore Stefanie.
 A-6825203, Gergits, Karl Alois.
 A-3535341, Giannichini, Gino or Gino Giannecchini or Gino Giannichini or Gino Giannecchini.
 A-6498461, Gonzalez, Hector Manuel Mostedo-Lopez or Hector Frazer.
 A-9836695, Hansen, Niels Thuroe.
 A-6920912, Hassab, Antoine Antoun.
 A-6329559, Henryk, Jan or John Henry Stillbach.
 A-6872523, Huff, Lucille May Plummer.
 A-3112979, Kaltenmaier, Eugen.
 A-5883854, Kenyeres, Andras or Andras Kanczuga.
 A-5883855, Kenyeres, Krisztina formerly Krisztina Deak (nee Molnar).
 A-4685154, Knuth, Herman Ernst.
 A-9659166, Kondlies, Gabriel.
 A-9671075, Koolhoven, Herman.
 A-7983079, Lanuez, Luis Alfredo or Luis Alfredo Laneuz Mendive.
 A-6730666, Liao, Tien Ren.
 A-6886839, Liao, Wei Ping Wu.
 A-8064339, Macias-Hague, Edna Antonio Aileen.
 A-5566403, Maruyama, Masamori or Paul Masamori Maruyama.
 A-5960624, Meyer, Irmgard Emma Martha.
 A-5673350, Muller, Joseph or Joe Muller.
 A-5531956, Nagel, Charles Bernhard.
 A-5970800, Neugebauer, Erich.
 A-5970801, Neugebauer, Gwendy Audrey.
 A-5970802, Neugebauer, Audrey Mooneyen.
 A-5886923, Nibbs, Phyllis Geneva.
 A-6965247, Nordmark, Dalton Everett.
 A-4360220, Ogle, William.
 A-1690705, O'Leary, Elizabeth.
 A-7192474, Osio, Antonio De Guerrero.
 A-7192475, Osio, Angelina Villaseñor De.
 V-192353, Pedota, Guiseppe Nicola.
 A-5995217, Pena-Flores, Salvador.
 1407-20647, Pena, Maria Lopez De.
 A-7176011, Pereira, Francisca Josefa.

A-7457684, Perez, Rafael Santiago Sanchez Y.
 A-7457685, Perez, Miriam Rogelia Sanchez Y.
 A-6332084, Pires, Donald George.
 A-2523066, Ransom, Alexandra Serjanko formerly Alexandra Zrum.
 A-5976847, Richards, Robert Vincent or Robert Vincent Soso.
 A-4763940, Robinson, Hilda Amy Jane nee Hilda Soso.
 A-2927242, Romano, Francesco or Frank Romano.
 A-8091608, Rosberg, Nechama or Nechama Farber.
 A-4871200, Royce, Dorothy Beryl (nee Fleming).
 A-4272778, Santiago, Joseph.
 A-2414442, Schaffer, Ludwig or Louis John Schaffer.
 A-5693325, Shaw, Gilbert Henry.
 A-5693329, Shaw, Edward Meredith.
 A-7197890, Shuster, David Abram.
 A-7197892, Shuster, Ida (nee Rubin).
 A-9765543, Springvloed, Arnold or Arnoldus Springvloed or Springvloed.
 A-4024200, Steinbrecher, Eduard Georg or George Edward Steinbrecher or Edward or Eduard Steinbrecher.
 A-6449231, Stephanidis, Dean Constantine John.
 A-5015878, Ticehurst, Katherine Elizabeth (nee McLellan).
 A-3161661, Tsarnas, Stephanos Emanuel.
 A-6275119, Valdovino-Navarro, Francisco.
 A-5320950, Welch, Cecil Carlisle.
 A-7445720, Wen, Shao Lien or Shao Hsiung.
 A-1560215, Wong, Shi Ching or Wong Shi Ching.
 A-4491534, Yee, Cora Sue Moy (nee Moy or Moy Su Wah or Su Wah Moy or Cora Sue Moy).
 A-9836629, Zvans, Carl or Karlis Zvans or Karl Zvans.
 A-7140102, Acosta, Gregorio or Gregorio Acosta Rodriguez.
 A-7140088, Carreon, Maria Mercedes or Maria Mercedes Carreon De Acosta.
 A-5804142, Afentakis, Konstantinos D.
 A-3444860, Antonoff, Spass or Spass Anthony or Stanley Anthony.
 A-5444895, Avramides, Clearchos Hercules.
 A-7962226, Ayo-Guanilo, Gabriel or Gabriel Ayo or Lucio Gabriel Ayo-Guanilo.
 A-3798195, Baisamo, Raffaele or Ralph Baisano.
 A-5930326, Barry, Violet Marie.
 A-6062967, Bateman, Florence Lillam formerly Florence Lillian Cunningham.
 V-941386, Bertucci, Primo.
 A-1743346, Borina, Nadina Grigorieva or Nadina Roman Grigorieva Borina or Nadina Roman Bakaleinikoff.
 A-5693328, Bradley, Edith May (nee Shaw).
 A-7049692, Brewster, Adelia Keturah.
 A7841167, Castillo, Ana Alvia nee Leon-Martinez.
 A-8014959, Christian, Ethel Virginia.
 A-6399522, Cooper, Josefa Artilles or Josefa Artilles or Josefa Artilles Vasquez.
 A-7251660, Crivello, Anna (nee San Filippo).
 V-934834, Cutino, Caterina Sansone.
 A-4025239, De Castro, Erilda Agatha.
 A-6476416, de Hoyos-Torres, Enrique or Henry de Hoyos.
 A-7702320, de Medeiros, Agnello Clementino.
 A-6937351, Dertien, Maartje (nee Sleutel).
 A-6660658, De Soto, Maria Salazar.
 A-1162399, De Velasquez, Natividad Lopez (nee Natividad Lopez).
 A-5101863, Di Giorgio, Domenico or Clagio Bennardo.
 A-7057985, Diorio, Mary Carmela.
 A-9535114, Do Nascimento, Joaquim or Joaquin Do Nascimento or Joaquin De Nascimento.
 A-7178251, Dounias, Garifalita or Garifaltea, or Garifalia (nee Trango).
 A-8001797, Erkus, Ali Orhan.
 A-8001796, Erkus, Guzide Nesrian.

A-5948745, Fleming, Ina.
 A-7049155, Florio-Macias, Armando.
 A-9825449, Fong, Eng Gum.
 A-5966266, Foy, Rachel Ann.
 A-8017203, Freeman, Samuel Frederick.
 A-7122091, Freshour, Raimund Haring.
 A-7197981, Gagliarducci, Pacifico.
 A-2346359, Garcia, Felix P.
 A-7978757, Garcia-Hurtado, Alfonso.
 A-7903421, Gibbs, Samuel James.
 A-8021949, Glass, Anya formerly Chana Singer.
 A-7995664, Gomez, Jorge.
 A-4827036, Gon, Mary Tom or Mary Quon Yee or Pung Kum or Gow Sheung or Fong Dai Muey.
 A-6846919, Gonzalez, Genaro.
 A-6846916, Gonzalez, Manuela Herlinda.
 A-6846917, Gonzalez, Alicia.
 A-6846918, Gonzalez, Roman Alfredo.
 A-5233140, Gonzalez-Vela, Manuel.
 A-5352453, Grasso, Joseph.
 A-4359194, Grenier, Marie Jeanne (nee Beauchemin).
 A-6482237, Griffiths, Ada Agnes.
 A-6482236, Griffiths, Thomas Littleton, Jr.
 A-6482235, Griffiths, John Scott Randolph.
 A-7435313, Grossholz, Iris.
 A-7435314, Grossholz, Heidemarie.
 A-7189146, Guccione, Matteo.
 A-4066587, Gugliotta, Michael Giuseppe or Michele Giuseppe Gugliotta.
 A-5967979, Gumbs, Joseph Nathaniel.
 A-6549358, Hallas, Mary Lillian.
 A-1577231, Harlan, Doris May.
 A-7043770, Harrigan, Cecil Cleve.
 A-4347545, Haskakis, William or Basilios Haskakis.
 V-661046, Heong, Kwai Ting alias May Kwai or Ting Heung Kwai.
 V-1078972, Hiatt, Clementina Bedoy.
 A-7999538, Hoover, George Melvin.
 A-3683690, Hoskinson, Bertha Rosalie or Berta Tiant de Munoz or Bertha Rosalie Tiant Y Rodriguez or Bertha Nonoz or Bertha Tyndall.
 A-6896031, Hyder, Yvonne G. (nee Had-dad).
 A-8014950, Industrious, Valentine.
 A-5782508, Industrious, May Louise.
 A-5438893, Itzkovitz, Evelyn Eve (nee Schnaier).
 A-4889195, Jakush, Alexander.
 56263/630, Karavasilis, Michalis or Ghatz-michalis or Hajimihalas or Hatsimihalas alias Demetrius or James Hajimihalas or Hatsimihalas.
 A-4133211, Kellman, John Reuben or Oscar Herbert.
 A-7983188, King, Albertha.
 A-1719615, King, Ordenia Gwyndhor (nee Garrold).
 A-7849694, Lay, Joachim Ellery.
 A-7356719, Lee, Yue Chang or Yue Lee.
 A-5971755, Leonard, Alice Olivia.
 A-5921673, Lettome, Anita (nee Venzen).
 A-7802509, Letsome, Norris Alexander.
 A-3565855, Lewis, Rene Rose.
 A-6450121, Liang, Daisy Yu Ching Liu formerly Yu Ching Liu.
 A-6271439, Liang, Ta.
 A-7415647, Lois, Ramon Novas.
 A-4482881, Lucchino, Antonio.
 A-6982455, Magas, Venetia Andre (nee Fragoiannopoulou).
 A-4937264, Malandrucolo, Michele L. or Mike Malandrucolo.
 A-4276678, Marohnich, Anton.
 A-2578212, Mazzilli, Giuseppe.
 A-6205358, McIlvain, Pilar Tobias.
 A-5067380, Mirbach, Wilhelm Joseph or William Joseph Mirbach.
 A-1631832, Nash, Frank Jesse alias Frank Jesse Nalsh.
 A-8117351, Navarro-Lozano, Rafael.
 A-3851086, Neave, Dorothy Kathleen (nee Smith).
 A-6492284, Nicolas, Jolita Quimangan alias Felipa Salbosa Laforga.
 A-3432011, Nilsen, Alfred Edward Martin.
 A-9607259, Penn, Gibson Alonzo.
 A-5852635, Penn, Ophelia Perlina.

A-5988746, Petersen, Ellen Rebecca.
 A-6295510, Picciottoli, Josephine Lucy (nee Cuomo).
 A-2522320, Radoontsoff, John E.
 A-8102958, Ranck, Gladys Karolyn formerly Kanther formerly Halliday (nee Madill).
 A-6860161, Rodriguez, Otilia Planas Punc-eles (nee Otilia Planas Punc-eles) or Otilia Punc-eles-Planas.
 A-8065865, Ronan, Alexander Wallace.
 A-5987803, Ronan, Christina.
 A-3458654, Ronzakowski, Wladyslaw or Walter Rolland.
 A-7967458, Salto, Isaac or Issac.
 A-6178372, Schermerhorn, Esperanza Bangui.
 A-4847982, Schnaier, Liba.
 A-4907048, Schnaier, Louis.
 A-7980292, Seller, Madeleine Antoinette.
 A-6002100, Smith, Conrad Arthur.
 A-8010661, Smith, Inez Beatrice.
 A-6631947, Soroko, Haim.
 A-6544316, Standaart, Johanna Margaretha.
 A-0611877, Steffen, Marie Elizabeth (nee Weber), formerly Czekalla or Elsie Steffah.
 A-7111334, Stiers, Dorothy (nee Bok Ye Pak).
 A-6816811, Stout, Maria Grazia Russo (nee Maria Grazia Russo).
 A-6245757, Strat, Athena.
 A-7065645, Sun, Lee Wing.
 A-7065635, Quong, Lee Wing.
 A-3092016, Tachibana, Iku.
 A-4641933, Takakuwa, Yayoi.
 A-7606771, Tiber, Erwin or Ervin Tiber.
 A-7178010, Toriella, Giovanni Francesco or James Franklin Hibes.
 A-6250841, Torrez, Andrew or Andres Torres.
 A-6887100, Triantafillis, Spero or Spiros Triantafillou.
 A-3848578, Tsi, Tsu Sih.
 A-5889279, Tutchter, Margaretta May (nee Kline).
 A-7616390, Vinyets, Antonio Rojas or Antonio Vinyets.
 A-6770010, Vinyets, Virginia (nee Moran) or Virginia Maria Del Pilar Moran Sierra Vinyets.
 A-5170833, Webber, Katherine Rose (nee Kehoe).
 A-8078910, Williams, George Ashbourne or George Ashbourn Williams or Ashburn Williams or George Williams or George A. Williams.
 A-6624332, Williams, Jack James.
 A-5971748, Williams, Vernon George.
 A-6541785, Williams, Inez.
 A-7863864, Woo, Sun Nam.
 A-5149798, Wundt, Mirdza Agnesa (nee Zirnis or Jackel or Gackel).
 A-3570617, Yee, June or John Yee.
 A-4827305, Zimmerman, Hazel Johanna (nee Ryan).
 A-6630018, Agnello, Elda Naomi (nee Pedrazzoli).
 A-1269810, Ala'i, Hershmat or Hechmat Alai or Heshmat Husain-Ala'i or Heshmat Alai.
 A-6465786, Alexander, Neville Garfield alias Neville Wilson.
 A-5886885, Alexay, Mary Krizsan or Mary Krizsan.
 A-6650760, Alquizola, Pia C. (nee Pia Caballero).
 A-8091720, Amey, George Wallace.
 A-6609666, Anastopoulos, Vasiliou Panagiotis alias Basil P. Anastopoulos.
 A-3765515, Anderson, Frank Ezediel.
 A-6043095, Anderson, George Ruthven or Boyse (Nickname) or Monte Cristo (State name).
 A-4381407, Andrichik, John or John Andrichick.
 A-5456402, Arpe, Carl Johannes Adolf Wilhelm or Carl William Arpe.
 A-4933624, Barbieri, Leonardo Antonio or Leon Barber.
 A-7809752, Bastian, Gladys Elaine.
 A-7019831, Gegin, Joseph Real Gaeton.

A-5970035, Belanger, Joseph Raymond Napoleon or Raymond Napoleon Belanger or Mattias Blzier.

A-7140098, Belmontes, Luz or Luz Belmontes De Rodriguez or Luz Belmontes De Cruz.

A-6997918, Berindei, George.
A-6997919, Berindei, Madeleine Jeanne.
A-2418775, Bismann, Georg.
A-7863967, Boivin, Patrick.
A-7991520, Boots, Habbe or Habbe Dorenbusch.

A-4809720, Burre, Karl Ferdinand.
0608-7520, Cabanzo, Jose Lanza alias Jose Cabanzo or Jose Lanzas.

A-7520764, Caldwell, Ivan Edwin Lindsay.
A-5374313, Campana, Francisco.
A-7589823, Campos, Juana Ampiro.
A-5786864, Carcich, Luca.
A-5402298, Challis, Elizabeth Lesley (nee Judd).

A-7264168, Champe, Olga Tapavichky alias Olga Petrovna Tapavichky.
A-9709799, Chen, Chin alias Jen Chin alias Chun Chan.

A-2481534, Cheng, Amber Lieng-Shan.
A-7879889, Chiu, Chung Chi alias Franklin Chiu.

A-8056959, Chiu, Shang Chun (nee Shang Chun Shu).
A-4641184, Chwalibog, Szyje Zaima now known as Joe Burg.

A-7712792, Clarke, Israel Edward.
A-6148907, Coster Felix.
A-2372178, Cruz-Herrera, Tomas Jose.
A-1469907, Cruz, Rosalina Reyes De.
A-5059353, Dainoff, Clara or Kraina Dainoff or Rose Draina Dainoff.

A-6860782, Di Maria, Annunziata.
0900-56713, De Vitis, Filippo or Di Vitis.
A-5055163, Del Vescovo, Cosmo.
A-7427042, Djakonovs, Alexej.
A-4507723, Economopoulos, Nicholas.

A-4684507, Ellenbogen, Mark or Mike Allen.
A-6921739, Esposito, Anthony.
A-4988318, Falvo, Sebastiano or Sam.
A-5952820, Galea, Giovanni Baittista.
A-5439085, Garcia, Reynaldo or Jose Reynaldo Garcia.

A-9669427, Georgandis, Adamantios.
A-7858118, Gilbert, Rosa Elvira Salas.
A-4744989, Gonsalves, Joseph alias Joseph Alexander Gonsalves.

A-7445900, Gonzalez, Gertrudis Mireles alias Gregorio Garza.
A-5977709, Gonzalez y Soto, Francisca or Francisca Gonzales or Francisca G. Patino or Francisca Vargas.

A-2320697, Gratsos, Helene.
A-7389931, Granziani, Cipriano.
A-7457706, Grevas, Efstathia or Afstathia Grivas.

A-3800537, Groz, Herman.
A-4958770, Hale-Rodriguez, Carlos.
A-4809648, Hamada, Harumatsu.
A-4312231, Heimerman, Marjorie (nee Labliberte).

A-7210378, Hellmann, Ise Anna Adolfine.
V-12484, Henriques, Jose Maria, Junior alias Joseph or Joe Costa.

A-6498411, Hernandez de Trejo, Ana Maria.
A-6498445, Trejo-Bravo, Antonio.
A-6498444, Hernandez, Maria Graciela or Graciela Trejo-Hernandez.

A-6498443, Trejo-Hernandez, Ana Maria Christina.
A-6883852, Herrera-Fidela, Fermin.

A-8015884, Hines, Roy Fitzgeralds or Aston Thomson.

A-3309720, Howes, Jorge Eugenio.
A-6271457, Hsien, Che Cheng.
A-7419845, Hua, Margaret Pal-Ya alias Margaret Zia.

A-5189047, Irvin, George.
A-5903725, James, Elecia Constanca.
A-7379701, Jung, Norbert Hermann, known as Norbert Hermann Kanyer.

A-1595698, Kawamoto, Yui.
A-7084211, Keller, Lieselotte Charlotte.
A-6848648, King, Sing.
V-369350, King, Cissie (aka Ng Fung Tsang King) (nee Ng Fung Tsang).

1000-19778, Kipper, Henry John.
A-4059204, Kilmanoff, Vladimir alias Adolph Piedro or Adolf Piedro.

A-6072051, Korbja, Paul Charles alias Pal Karoly Korbaj.

A-6756670, Kostis, Vasiliki alias Vassiliki Kostis (nee Razis).

A-1789925, Krendle, Lily (Lilly) or Lillian Crandell.

A-9825376, Larino, Manuel Lamela.
A-7424881, Lawrence, Dale.
A-7558790, Lawrence, Sandra Jill.

A-2020548, Lazaroff, Zaharia (nee Pop Thanas).

A-7903004, Lee, Hing Jeung alias Lee Hing or Hing Lee.
A-6165966, Linares, Bruno.
A-6474925, Lopez, Salvador Calvillo.

A-4065628, Lucin, Bozo or Bob Lucin or Bozo Nicholas Lucin.
A-7283445, MacLeod, Phillipa Beatrice Collins.

A-7483284, Madrell, Robert Scott.
A-7483285, Madrell, Evelyn Maud.
A-5900738, Maduro, Lillian Agatha.
A-6576006, Malorano, Enrico.
A-7457248, Malorano, Barbara.

A-7225043, Man, Fung.
A-6365490, Mandamadiotis, Sperios Demetriou.

0301-18521, Manetas, Anthony Demetrios.
A-7025022, Mark, Wee Git also known as Fred Mark, Jr.

A-8106254, Markes, Christ Harry formerly Christos Markos.
1100-25000, Martinez-Flores, Jose known as Joseph Florez Martinez.

A-1060161, Matancias-Morales, Candelario.
A-8080689, McDonald, Albertina (nee Fanfani).

A-1771384, McLeod, Pearl formerly Venner (nee Churchill).

A-6011826, Mefford, Florence Vivian formerly Bryan (nee Alexandra).

A-7886788, Meljer, Manfred.
A-5825318, Mendolia, Margarette Sofie or Margarette Jensen.

A-6057677, Meyers, Blanche.
A-5932933, Meyers, Clemencia Dawson.
A-3285696, Miyashita, Katsuyoshi alias K. Hirayama.

A-6178929, Morch, Milan (William) or Edward William Sadig-Alved or Edward William Cecil.

A-5645201, Morquecho-Hernandez, Jose.
A-5690083, Morquecho, Angela Ramirez de.

A-4531719, Morris, Stafford Clinton.
A-2566504, Muentes, Ignacio Rogoberto.
A-7222175, Nilsson, Egil Martin.

0807-4942, Olmoz-Andaverde, Amelia alias Maria Ulda Gonzalez.
A-7117819, Papa, Domenico.

A-6989658, Papazidis, Christos or Chris Papazidis.
A-6989915, Pardo, Roman Becerra or Roman Becerra.

1600-95282, Pena-Ceja, Alfonso.
T-1774508, Perera y Suarez, Armando Elpidio alias Armando Elpidio Perera.

A-8057558, Piazza, Giuseppe Celestino alias Joe Turri.

A-5265022, Poriles, Jennie (nee Bazar).
A-7821700, Portelli, Giuseppe or Joseph.

A-3380724, Prentiss, Annie Catherine (nee Delves).

V-1465729, Prevots, Georgette Marie Louise (nee Clerhout).

A-7903801, Quilogue, Francis.
0616-1568, Rabstatt, Vaneta.

A-7383689, Rathbun, Margaret Annie formerly Howard (nee Sedgman).

A-4721933, Reimann, Emma Augustie.
A-7978828, Richards, Helen Ruth.
A-8001777, Richardson, Reuben Johnson.

A-5393445, Ringwall, Emil or Konrad Emil Ringwall.

A-3641414, Ross, Angus Nicholson.
A-8010610, Roza, Socorro Dela (nee Buraga).

A-7941746, Rubin, Mihaly.
A-7189842, Rumfeld, Heinz Albert.
A-3607555, Sam, Chu Buck or Buck-Sam Chu.

A-6336122, Shar, Tom Tze or (Mrs.) Buck-Sam Chu.

A-9748289, Santalla, Carlos or Carlos Santalla Lojo.

A-4980723, Sardo, Manuel Ferreira.
1300-110059, Scopazzi, Albino.

A-6743297, Sedilo, Evelyn May formerly Evelyn May Hollingum.

A-3483335, Seimberg, Heinrich.
A-4750637, Seimberg, Emma.
A-5967454, Shlrado, Seishu.

A-7818429, Skouson, Peter James.
A-66770579, Smith, Henry Hallam.
A-6621142, Spira, Pinchas (nee Pinhas Shapiro).

A-3598815, Steiner, Elizabeth Bessie.
A-5964203, Stenzel, William.
A-7279651, Stern, Eva Stepanek.

A-7141224, Stoppani, Caridad (nee Trevejo also known as Caridad Fernandez Trevjo Rodriguez).

A-7978816, Storrs, Margaret (nee Rush).
A-7978815, Storrs, Timothy John.
A-7980305, Storrs, Peter Kip, Jr.

A-5949820, Stramm, George Carl Bruno.
A-6610968, Suavage-Gonzalez, Carlos or Carlos G. Suavage.

0502-6546, Sup, Chong or Chang.
A-6216393, Sylvestrowicz, Stefania formerly Bielawa (nee Wolinska).

A-4368963, Takakuwa, Shujiro.
A-4433609, Tanaka, Hiraku or Henry Tanaka.

V-155193, Tebele, Linda (nee Cohen).
A-1101889, Theodorakis, John.
A-6963152, Threifall, Ella Maarit Hyrylainen.

0803-2303, Torres, Felix.
A-8117373, Torres, Severa Valencia.
A-9634774, Tramontano, Francesco or Franco or Frank.

A-5948749, Turnbull, Esme Viola.
A-2682458, Ullah, Walter or Walter All.
V-6423, Uyehara, Marianna Teiko.

A-5784790, Valdes, Joaquin Munoz or Joaquin Munoz.

A-7387449, Valentino, Ernesto.
A-3193878, Valeriano, Francesco or Francesco or Frank Vallarino.

A-6245147, Venetis, Koula.
A-7222547, Verze, Antonio or Anthony Verze.

A-7130589, Villarreal, Margarito Leal.
A-7046255, Wlazemsky, Pauline Princess (nee Pauline Cumbo).

A-7046241, Obolensky, Lydia Princess (nee Lydia Cumbo).

0616-2461, Williams, Melanie Olivia.
A-4004798, Wong, Beatrice or Yuen Choy Kee.

A-6317860, Wong, Gordon Patrick or Youe Han Wong.
A-6497638, Wong, Sun Chong or Wang.

A-6497641, Lee, Tse Seng.
A-4053840, Wu, Pai Tuan.
A-3401043, Yow, Jung known as You Jung known as Yow Jung.

A-7984804, Zamorano-Garcia, Segundo or Ramon Miramontes or Ramiro Miramontes.

A-6989249, Zani, Cesare or Chester Zani.
A-9726397, Zawadzki, Witold.

V-1462278, Zuder, Jacqueline Ivy (nee Cairns).

A-2622696, Zumbo, Paul.
A-5225187, Alexandridi, Alexandrina Maria or Sandra Alexandridi.

A-5305385, Allaer, Alfons Albert.
A-4902610, Allaer, Helena Charliette (nee Van Der Haegen).

A-4808339, Araujo, Francisco Alexandre or Francisco Alexandre or Francisco Araujo.

A-4797132, Bonifacio, Gaspar.
A-6845710, Brooks, Newton Alvin or Rudolph Crossdale.

A-8015494, Carboni, Ciro Carlo.
A-4792487, Cassidy, James Joseph.
V-939068, Chelini, Giuliano.

A-7748712, Choy, Alfred Hernandez.

A-7983490, De Miranda, Socorro Cardenas or Maria De Socorro Cardenas or Socorro Cardenas.

A-5960317, Dona, Mario Antonio or Mario Antonio Nandino Dona or Mario Dona or Dona Mario Antonio.

A-5856811, Engel, Eira Deryn.

A-7112023, Estrada, Jose Luis.

A-6881287, Franco, Gonzalo or Gonzalo Franco-Acosta.

A-6828807, Gettas, Gus Peter or Constantinos Gkitzias.

A-6817855, Haddad, Alfred or Fred Haddad.

A-4463290, Herrera-Hernandez, Pablo.

A-6709361, Hodge, Henrietta Rose (nee Brown).

A-2626026, Holter, Anna Josephine.

A-4678190, Krute, Fritz Heinrich.

A-5237120, Krute, Anna Sophie.

A-3449747, Lahikainen, Otto or Henry Johnson.

A-7941123, Lew, Suey Sen or Robert Lew or Lew Wo Ching or Lew Suey Sen.

A-3361379, Lopez, Serafin or Rafael Serafin Lopez Rajo.

A-6597443, McIlrath, Elena Dolores (nee Ortiz-Milord).

A-4160485, Moreno-Sanchez, Refugio.

A-6923176, Nguyen, Nguyen Thanh.

A-6849421, Nguyen, Li Thi or Thi Ly Phan.

A-7858019, Novella, Daniel Palma.

1600-99778, Ochoa-Ochoa, Robert or Roberto Ochoa-Ochoa.

A-7740671, Ozamis-Ormaechea, Domingo.

A-7079629, Papayannacos, Stylianos.

A-4864916, Pelayo, Soledad Garcia (nee Soledad Garcia Albarracin).

A-1732177, Petok, Irma or Emma.

A-6268920, Preen, Brian Norman.

A-6288190, Preen, Harold Norman.

A-6268921, Preen, Kate Helen or Kate Ellen Haferkorn.

A-2308244, Raimo, Gennaro.

A-7984830, Ramirez, Victoria Orozco or Victoria Orozco.

A-5582943, Roblejo-Rober, Jose Celedonio or Charlie Molina or Joseph Roblejo.

A-6833430, Rodriguez, Miguel Flores or Miguel Flores or Miguel Angel Flores.

A-7298526, Rumi, Amalia Julianna (nee Mezel).

A-7019158, Saunders, Joan.

A-4456942, Schillaci, Angelina.

A-4456944, Schillaci, Philip.

A-4946941, Schintu, Giuseppe Salvatore or Joseph Schintu or Joseph or Giuseppe Salvatore Pinna or Joseph S. Pinna.

A-4585065, Schultz, Senior, Martin.

A-1718311, Sergei, Jacob or Jack Sergei or Jacob or Jack Shergel.

A-5166619, Shuell, Michael Elmer.

A-7991978, Sitaras, Byron John or Viron Sitaras.

A-9509086, Tarkowski, Franciszek or Frank Tarkowski.

A-4553895, Thompson, Susannah (nee Wylie).

A-6989243, Trotman, Vivian Estelle or Vivian Estella Webbe-Mary Estella Meade-Mary.

V-38960, Valenti, Giuseppina or Giuseppa Valenti (nee Pagano).

1209-9337, Walter, Frank Edy or Frank E. Ruhl or Frank Edy Foster.

A-4625481, Wechsler, Irene (nee Fischer or Rosalia (Rosa) Perlstein).

A-6755973, Wein, Wu Big or Wu Big Woon or Mrs. Mark Chong.

A-4083830, Westphal, Frank or Franz Theodore August Westphal.

A-5359781, Vergottis, George C.

A-4674944, Vergottis, Mary G.

0300-260344, Dehkan, Afsar.

A-6381363, Dehkan, Abdul or Abdul Hus-sain Dehkan.

A-5975666, Loukatos, Evangelos Kosmas.

A-2320696, Gratsos, Constantin George.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out the matter as it appears on:

Page 6, line 10; page 8, line 22; page 17,

line 9; page 20, line 6; page 32, line 25; page

39, line 18; and on page 45, after line 12, add the following:

"A-9532298, Mathisen, Wollert.

"A-1331075, Williams, George Kapa.

"A-7145943, Prisciandaro, Damiano.

"A-4193296, Zaganas, Leonidas, alias Leo Z. Gray.

"A-7019831, Begin, Joseph Real Gaeton.

"A-6670579, Smith, Henry Hallam."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

N. A. G. L. MOERINGS ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 665) for the relief of N. A. G. L. Moerings, Mrs. Bertha Johanna Krayenbrink Moerings, and Lambertus Karel Aloysius Josef Moerings.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, N. A. G. L. Moerings, Mrs. Bertha Johanna Krayenbrink Moerings, his wife, and Lambertus Karel Aloysius Josef Moerings, their minor child, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PORFIRIO PUNCIANO VILA ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 761) for the relief of Porfirio Punciano Vila, Tatiana Abatooroff Vila, Porfirio P. Vila, Jr., Anne Marie Vila, and Josephine Anne Vila.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws Porfirio Punciano Vila; Tatiana Abatooroff Vila, his wife; and Porfirio P. Vila, Jr., Anne Marie Vila, and Josephine Anne Vila, his children, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct five numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "immigration and naturalization laws" and substitute the words "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out the words "and head taxes."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TIEN KOO CHEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 765) for the relief of Tien Koo Chen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tien Koo Chen (also known as Chen Tien Koo) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT J. RICKARDS ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 847) for the relief of Robert J. Rickards, Conception Sotelo Rickards, and Walter John Rickards.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Robert J. Rickards, Conception Sotelo Rickards, and Walter John Rickards shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MASUKO OSHIMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 869) for the relief of Masuko Oshima.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens, inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Masuko Oshima, the Japanese fiancé of Lt. Col. Carl H. Cundiff, a citizen of the United States and a member of the staff in the Adjutant General's Office, and that Masuko Oshima may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Masuko Oshima is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Carl H. Cundiff, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Masuko Oshima, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after entry of said Masuko Oshima, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful

admission for permanent residence of said Masuko Oshima, as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required fees and head taxes.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Masuko Oshima, the fiancée of Lt. Col. Carl H. Cundiff, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Masuko Oshima is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Lt. Col. Carl H. Cundiff and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Masuko Oshima, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Masuko Oshima, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Masuko Oshima as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAY OF DEPORTATION PROCEEDINGS ON EUGENE DE THASSY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1756) to stay deportation proceedings on Eugene de Thassy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of immigration and naturalization laws, Eugene de Thassy shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 3, strike out the words "immigration and naturalization laws," and substitute in lieu thereof "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On line 7, strike out the words "and head tax."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Eugene de Thassy."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL MYUNG HA CHUNG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1886) for the relief of Paul Myung Ha Chung. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Paul Myung Ha Chung shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On lines 3 and 4 strike out the words "immigration and naturalization laws", and substitute the words "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On line 7, strike out the words "and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNELIESE SCHILLINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1963) for the relief of Anneliese Schillings.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anneliese Schillings, the German fiancée of Cpl. Giovannibattista Tudisca, a citizen of the United States and member of the Armed Forces of the United States, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Anneliese Schillings is married to the said Cpl. Giovannibattista Tudisca, within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anneliese Schillings, the fiancée of Cpl. Giovannibattista Tudisca, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Anneliese Schillings is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Cpl. Giovannibattista Tudisca and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, other than the provisions of section 212 (2) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anne-

liese Schillings, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anneliese Schillings, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Anneliese Schillings as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAM ROSENBLAT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2351) for the relief of Sam Rosenblat.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sam Rosenblat may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTANCE BROUWER SCHEFFER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2652) for the relief of Constance Brouwer Scheffer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Constance Brouwer Scheffer, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. George W. Williams, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEFINE HOORN (DMYTRUK)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2787) for the relief of Josefina Hoorn (Dmytruk).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Josefina Hoorn (Dmytruk), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Cornelius F. Hoorn, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JULIA GAMROTH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3670) for the relief of Mrs. Julia Gamroth.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Julia Gamroth, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oath prescribed by section 335 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Mrs. Julia Gamroth shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Julia Gamroth shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the Private Calendar.

DANIEL ROBERT LEARY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES RETURNING BILL PURSUANT TO HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 99

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), I return herewith H. R. 1101, entitled "An act for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary."

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 19, 1953.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to address the House on May 25 for 30 minutes, instead of the 20 already granted.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE CREATION OF THE NATIONAL FLAG OF HAITI

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 237.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas 150 years ago, on May 18, 1803, Gen. Jean Jacques Dessalines created the national flag of Haiti and thereby established national unity among the forces working for Haitian independence; and

Whereas through the years the Republic of Haiti has played an important part in the historical and cultural development of the United States and the other American nations; and

Whereas the House of Representatives recognizes the significant contributions which have been made by the Republic of Haiti to the achievement of closer ties between the nations of the Western Hemisphere: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its cordial greetings to the Republic of Haiti on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the creation of the national flag of Haiti, and expresses the deep friendship of the people of the United States for the people of Haiti, recognizing the historical and cultural contributions which have been made by the Republic of Haiti to the nations of the Western Hemisphere and reaffirming its profound desire for the continuance of the warm and mutually beneficial relationship presently existing between the Republic of Haiti and the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, today throughout the Western Hemisphere we are commemorating a historical event. Just 150 years ago Gen. Jean Jacques Dessalines, commander in chief of the Haitian armies, saw fit to create the national flag of the Republic of Haiti. Some days previous, at what was called the Congress of Arcahaie, the principal leaders of the Haitian independence movement, gathered together in order to concert measures of national unity. One of the illustrious sons of Haiti who inspired this unification movement, was Alexandre Pétion, founder and first President of the Republic of Haiti. Up to this month of May in 1803, the forces working for Haitian independence had been somewhat scattered and disorganized. It was the destiny of Commander in Chief Dessalines to establish a formula of unity in order to give his people a symbol of their new understanding of each other. He decided to create a national flag. Until May 18, 1803, the flag that was most familiar to the people of the island was the French tricolor—blue, white, and red. General Dessalines, realized that the blacks and the mulattos would have to join forces in order to achieve freedom, removed the white band from the center of the French tricolor. In this way the blue and the red were placed side by side as a symbol of the Negroes and mulattos who were to stand shoulder to shoulder in their quest for independence.

The establishment of the national flag had an electrifying effect upon the majority of the people of Haiti. Rallying around their leaders they began to defend themselves against the powerful armies of Napoleon Bonaparte, First Counsel of France. Little by little the foreign legions were pushed back until late in November they were forced to flee

from the island itself. This victory of the Haitians under their national flag, terminated the dream of Napoleon to establish a French Empire in the New World. Indeed, he was intimidated to such an extent that he immediately sought to sell Louisiana to the United States of America. And that is why, by a happy historical incident, the anniversary of the creation of the flag of Haiti and the acquisition of the State of Louisiana by the United States are being commemorated in the same year. And it is an equally felicitous conjuncture that the first article written for publication by His Excellency Ambassador Jacques Leger of Haiti was on the subject *The Acquisition of Louisiana*. In this article M. Leger pointed out a historical fact of the first magnitude, namely, that the triumph of the forerunner of Haitian independence, Toussaint L'Ouverture, paved the way for the extension of United States territory from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean.

It is likewise a historical fact of a most interesting character that the Haitian patriot, Alexandre Pétion, gave hospitality of a most valuable character to the great liberator of South America, Simón Bolívar, at a time when the latter had been routed on the mainland and had no other place of refuge. President Pétion, with a generosity characteristic of the Haitian people, not only preserved the life of Bolívar, but also gave him, freely, the money, the arms and the provisions which enabled the great liberator to return to his country and complete the work to which he had set his hand. There was only one request that President Pétion made to Bolívar on the occasion. The Haitian leader simply asked that slavery, as a result of liberation, would be abolished on the free soil of America. This was a promise, Mr. Speaker, that I am happy to report was fulfilled loyally by the noblehearted son of Venezuela.

From this recital of history it must be clearly apparent to the Congress and the United States of America how much all of us in the Western Hemisphere owe to the magnanimous initiative and splendid loyalty of the President of Haiti. Consequently all of us can join in the celebration with the utmost sincerity and enthusiasm. The ceremonies in connection with this event are to continue from the 18th of May 1953 to the 1st of January 1954. The commemoration marks a glorious chapter in the history of inter-American friendship.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as we join in observing the 150th anniversary of the creation of the Haitian national emblem several thoughts occur to me that may be worthy of consideration.

First, it is evident from the event we are commemorating here today that the genius for freedom and independence is not limited to the people of any one race, creed or color.

Second, the history of Haiti demonstrates, as does our own, that while liberty may be gained by one generation responding to inspired leadership, freedom can be preserved only if succeeding generations demonstrate their worthiness and determination to remain free.

Third, here in the relationship between Haiti and the United States of America we see the small independent nation existing peacefully in the shadow of a giant among world powers—without the slightest fear of aggression from our direction.

We have proved, down through the years, that we do not covet the territory of our neighbors. Instead, we respect their integrity, cherish their friendship and value the reciprocal customer relations we have built up in the trade lanes down through the years.

Mindful of the contributions made by Haiti to the cause of human liberty in the Western Hemisphere, our Nation has always stood ready to lend a helping hand when it was needed.

Let it be pointed out that there has never been an occasion for the people of Haiti to doubt our intentions. Not by words, but by deeds, we have demonstrated the honor of our motives in helping Haiti to preserve its atmosphere of freedom and peace.

As one neighbor to another, then, we are happy to pause here today to acknowledge Haiti's contribution to mankind's struggle against tyranny; to reaffirm the traditional spirit of friendship between our countries; and finally, to extend sincere congratulations to Haiti for having reached a significant milestone in what we are confident will be a long and honorable history of achievement among nations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 150 years ago Gen. Jean Jacques Dessalines, commander in chief of the Haitian armies striving for their independence against Napoleon Bonaparte, summoned his leading generals to a meeting at Arcabaile, a town near the capital, Port-au-Prince. The idea for this gathering had come to General Dessalines from Alexandre Pétion, who, in subsequent years, was to gain fame as the founder and first President of the Republic of Haiti. It was felt that a dramatic gesture was needed to unite the people of the island in their struggle for freedom.

This drama was provided by General Dessalines. On May 18, 1803, 150 years ago today, the Haitian patriot, taking the French tricolor in his hand, removed the white band in the center and drew together the blue and red colors: a symbol of the spiritual union of the blacks and the mulattoes. Instantly, the scattered hosts of Haitian independence realized that they had found a natural leader. From that day forward, the people knew that they would have in Jean Jacques Dessalines an intelligent, brave commander in chief. The Haitian objective became clear to all: An independent, free Republic. Within 6 months, the Napoleonic armies were in full retreat. On November 29, 1803,

while the people of Haiti took possession of Cap Haitien, the last remnants of Bonaparte embarked at Môle St.-Nicolas to return to their homeland, France. The national flag of Haiti had played its role in the emancipation of the island.

At a time when the Congress of the United States of America is extending to the people and the Government of Haiti warm congratulations upon a happy anniversary, it may be appropriate to add a few words about the outstanding heroes of Haitian independence. One of the champions of freedom, whose names have resounded in history, was the son of a slave, Toussaint L'Ouverture. Thanks to a wealth of natural talent, Toussaint learned the uses of many medicinal herbs. This knowledge was utilized for the benefit of his fellow men. It also gave him a place of leadership among his fellow slaves. Toussaint, it can be noted, was a devout believer in God. His deep religious convictions freed him of racial animosity. His one dream was to secure fair treatment for his people on the island. Although this gifted man never received any formal military training, he developed remarkable facilities for discovering almost everything planned by Napoleon's generals. Consequently, in the words of a contemporaneous historian, Toussaint L'Ouverture emerged as "a top-flight military leader with an unusual humanitarian record."

In one of his orders to generals in the field, Toussaint wrote as follows:

I have given instructions to my commanders to treat all prisoners with humanity.

In order to crush Toussaint and to re-establish slavery in Saint-Domingue, the French First Consul, Bonaparte, sent to the Caribbean the largest fleet and most powerful expeditionary force that had ever crossed the Atlantic. Although Toussaint L'Ouverture suffered reverses and died in prison, a victim of treachery, the noblehearted Haitian leader handed on the torch of liberty to his compatriots, Alexandre Pétion, Henry Christophe, and Jean Jacques Dessalines. Toussaint was the forerunner of liberty in the Caribbean. It was the destiny of his brothers-in-arms to complete the work of victory.

One of the most notable results of Haitian independence, a movement which derived inspiration from the national flag of the republic, was the definitive repulse of Napoleon in the New World and the termination of the French dream of an empire in the Mississippi Valley. When the French armies evacuated Saint-Domingue, Bonaparte, reading the handwriting on the wall, began negotiations which led to the acquisition of the Louisiana Territory for the United States of America. This important achievement by President Thomas Jefferson was due, in part, to the triumph of the people of Haiti. The intelligent courage of General Dessalines and the vision of President Jefferson paved the way for the Louisiana Purchase. Consequently, we in the Western Hemisphere are commemorating the creation of the national standard of the Republic of Haiti in the same year that we recall, with sentiments of loyal gratitude, the epochal decision of one of our great Pres-

idents. The simultaneous celebration is no accident; it represents the union of hearts and of minds that is characteristic of America.

I congratulate the Government and the people of Haiti on this celebration, and in particular on the great progress their country has made during this period. The people of Haiti of this generation have received a great heritage from their forebears.

Maintaining their faith in and love of God they will not only preserve but improve upon the Government they inherited and that they now possess.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 5 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5227, with Mr. McCULLOCH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture once again brings to the floor of the House for your approval the annual supply bill for the Department of Agriculture. As chairman of that subcommittee, I would be remiss if I were not to express my sincere appreciation for the splendid cooperation given to me during the hearings and markup of this bill by the other members of this subcommittee. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] has an intimate knowledge of forestry problems, of conservation and of research in every field. The gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], two new members of our subcommittee on the Republican side, have aided immeasurably by their clear and succinct questioning of the witnesses and

their developing of the various questions called to the attention of the committee. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], minority member of the committee and former chairman, brings to the subcommittee his store of knowledge in relation to agriculture, gained from his 10 years upon this committee. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] have cooperated in every way possible and all of us have maintained in our subcommittee a bipartisan approach to all of the financial problems facing agriculture. I feel that I am extremely fortunate in having gentlemen of the caliber of these six men sitting with me and advising with me as to what we should bring out on the floor of the House for consideration by the Congress. I also feel fortunate in having as our executive clerk Mr. Ross Pope, who is fast gaining a reputation for ability second to none on our Appropriations Committee staff.

The deliberations of our committee as to the financial needs of the Department of Agriculture, together with its related activities, have been centered around the basic need for preserving a prosperous agriculture. Anyone who has made a study of the economic progress of our Nation will admit that we cannot have a prosperous United States of America unless we are willing to grant the same degree of prosperity to each separate segment which makes up our economy. We in agriculture are not requesting that the farmer be given special privilege in any way. We do ask and we do demand that he be given a fair and equal opportunity with labor, with industry, and with all other groups to share in the bountiful resources of these great United States of America.

During my 15 years in Congress, I have fought for one principal objective—parity prices for all farm commodities. The farmer does not want an unreasonable price for what he produces but inasmuch as his expenses have skyrocketed just as much as they have in all other industries, he must receive prices for what he produces which will maintain his position in our national picture—which is to say, he must receive parity prices for every farm commodity.

The No. 1 duty of Members of Congress now is to see to it that the money and machinery necessary to cushion the shock of any possible drop in farm prices shall be available if the need shall arise. A small surplus is sufficient excuse for the speculators to break the market. Farm prices are barometers of national welfare. Let us, therefore, make certain that no economic storm be foretold by the farm-price barometer. Let us insure that farm prices shall not fall below a reasonable level. We must have the necessary gross national income if we are to continue to meet the huge drains on our Treasury, which will be with us for years to come.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, a fair price for farm products is the first essential of a prosperous nation. A drop of only 10 cents in the value of a bushel of corn means a loss of \$300 to the average farmer in my seventh district. Twenty cents reduction per bushel for barley will cost him another \$200, while a fall

of a dime per pound of butterfat will create an extra deficit of \$150. Our farmers must have the income if we are to be able to pay current prices for labor and everything we buy. Give the farmers of the Nation at least 30 billions in income and we need not fear any economic crisis in our country. The farm dollar exchanges hands 7 times creating an income for the Nation of 7 times whatever the farmer receives gross for his products.

Our ceiling programs, bolstered by the Commodity Credit Corporation are the most important part of our farm program. We must preserve this program. If a severe drop in prices hits agriculture, it may cost the farmers of the Nation \$8 billion in 1 year and will result in creating unemployment in every community of our Nation.

We must have and must keep machinery available in each and every township and county ready to start the wheels rolling for placing loans under grain, if they are needed.

It is because of my personal experience as a farmer that I am convinced of the great need for keeping the framework of this committee structure intact and available for possible future needs and I have spent many hours trying to convince other Members of Congress of the value of our triple-A committees. Without them, or a similar group, we cannot have a successful farm program, nor would we have any machinery to throw into action if a tailspin in farm prices developed. God help our Nation if any such catastrophe should happen again. A severe fall in farm-commodity values is so absolutely unnecessary that it is almost criminal to permit its recurrence. All we need do is keep farm income at a reasonable level and the gross income for the rest of the Nation will, as a matter of course, keep its own relative position.

May I respectfully suggest that too many Members on the floor of the House have imbedded in their minds that the farmers, that agriculture as such in America, are the recipients of huge subsidies, paid for by the other taxpayers of this Nation. Nothing can be further from the truth. Please let us orient our line of thinking here before we proceed. May I ask you to turn to part 1 of our hearings, page 42, and study carefully that table as given there.

During World War II there was paid out of the Treasury of the United States \$4.2 billion for the sole purpose of bringing to the consuming public cheaper food. This is the reverse of the expenditures to support the price of farm commodities. Since 1933 through January 1, 1953, the cost to the Treasury of the United States in what might be classified as farm price supports was \$1,064,000,000. In other words, since 1933 up to this date, about one quarter as much money has been expended in behalf of keeping up the price for the farmer in America as there has been expended for holding down the price of food to the consumer. Let us remember also that if OPA rollbacks on pork, beef, veal, lamb, and mutton, let alone butter and milk products, had not been put into effect during World War II, farmers of America would have during that time received

at least \$10 billion more for their products than they did. Furthermore, through expenditure of \$1,070,000,000 during the last 20 years for price supports, at least 10 times that amount has been paid as additional income taxes by farmers because of their having that degree of protection and as a result a degree of prosperity approaching that of other portions of our economy.

Business as such was subsidized by the taxpayers to the extent of \$40,787,864,000, following the end of World War II in what was known as business reconversion payments—including tax amortization. Yet the Chamber of Commerce of the United States this past week has seen fit to protest, in a special edition of its publication *Spending Facts* against what it terms "an unneeded farm subsidy program." They have not to my knowledge protested in the past 6 years against the giving to business of at least 55 times as much of the taxpayers money as contained in this one bill for the operation of the entire Department for 1 year.

I have noticed, Mr. Chairman, protests in the press against what is termed undue liberality to our one basic industry, agriculture. This same press has not protested against the out-and-out subsidy given them in second- and third-class postal rates, amounting to more over the same period than the entire cost of our price-support program.

Much will be said during this debate relative to so-called subsidies due to farmers along the line of soil-conservation payments. Ladies and gentlemen of this Congress, if there is any one possession or physical asset of this Nation that is important, outside of the human element, that physical asset is our soil. Remember that our population is increasing at the rate of 2,700,000 persons a year. This requires in turn an increase in our food production of an estimated 7½ million acres of good farm land. You will note Dr. Shaw's statement page 266, part 2 of the hearings, to the effect that if our population continues to increase at the present rate of growth, we will have 190 million people here in the United States to feed by 1965, only 12 years from now. To feed these additional people will require 115 million acres of additional production. Through research we may be able to secure the equivalent of 45 million acres, by increasing production on the nearly 400 million acres now in cropland. But where will we obtain the other 70 million acres?

Yes, some small amount from reclamation. Where can we turn except to more and more increase in production. That means better and better soils. Is it not of the paramount importance that we continue the incentives of soil conservation? Cannot we afford to spend on our soils, in payments in part for good soil-conservation practices, an amount equal to two-fifths of the cost of keeping one combat division in operation. Do you not think we must keep our food production going upward to prevent a lowering of our diet level, which in turn would mean an America on the way down as a decaying Nation? I am sure that you do.

Upon the quality and beneficence of our soils rests the future of America. Plainly speaking, it makes me sick and tired to hear some of our colleagues unthinkingly, I am sure, object to the spending upon the soils of America for the good of future generations to come of a sum annually equal to that which, during the last 2 years, they have appropriated with very little debate for an aircraft carrier. Surely even though we are today at war this great Nation of ours can find \$169 million, the net available of the \$195 million in the bill for distribution to farmers, to use as incentive payments and part reimbursement of conservation costs to farmers of this Nation so that our soils can be passed on to the coming generations better than we as farmers today have them. To me that is only good, common sense. When peace comes, which all of us hope will not be too far distant, we will not have the necessity of spending the billions we do upon armaments and such, we should then seriously evaluate this soil conservation program and add to this investment of \$169 million at least another \$100 million annually for the preservation of our soils. Let us remember that while the average farmer may recognize the need for carrying out soil conservation practices, he is naturally influenced by the fact that his interest in the land may be for a relatively short period of time. This applies especially to the tenant farmers of America. Let us remember, on the other hand, that the interest of the Nation as a whole in the land is for an indefinite period of time in the future. The strength of our Nation and its welfare depends upon the continued productivity of the soil and its water resources. When we forget these fundamental truths, ladies and gentlemen, our great United States of America will cease to be the great Nation that it has been in the past.

Gentlemen, the list of various activities of the Department are before you in this report that we have brought to you. I will not enumerate them. You can see for yourself what we have done for research in every field. You can see what we have done for our experiment stations, our Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, the Bureau of Animal Industries, the Bureau of Dairy Industry, the Bureau of Agricultural Industrial Chemistry, the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine.

You can examine into our actions relative to the Forest Service and Flood Prevention, and our new program as initiated here in relation to watershed protection. It is my sincere hope that this program as described on page 9 of the report will be the beginning of a great program of watershed protection throughout America. You will note that here we are providing for 50 small pilot plant watershed areas scattered throughout the United States in areas selected because of the problems which they represent. We have provided an appropriation of \$5 million for fiscal 1954 and are limiting the total expenditures upon these 50 projects from now to the period of the conclusion of their construction to \$29 million. In no case

is the cost of any one project to exceed \$3 million.

We are attempting to find out the answer to the age-old question, Mr. Chairman, as to how and where can we best stop floods and hold back our soils and keep these soils from drifting down into the sea or filling up the vast reservoirs behind dams. The Congress of the United States has made available through the Army Engineers nearly \$4 billion of actual appropriations for the purpose of constructing huge dams and control works along the main stems of our rivers. By this pilot plant operation at a total cost of \$29 million, if we can prove the needless construction for even one or two of these dams, this money will have been returned to the taxpayers 10 times over.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, may I emphasize this fact. The amount recommended in direct appropriations for this coming fiscal year for the regular activities of the Department is \$24,301,505 less than the funds available for 1953. Furthermore, because of the expected acreage controls for the 1954 crop year on wheat and cotton, we have been compelled to include here \$27,500,000 for that purpose. Were it not for this new activity our direct appropriations in this bill would have been \$53,801,505 less than in 1953.

We have decreased the size of the announced soil conservation payment program for 1954 by \$55 million. Soil Conservation Service, however, is kept at the present scale of operations.

We have insisted on keeping the loan programs, Rural Electrification, Rural Telephone, and the Farmers Home at a sufficiently high level to continue the operation of those splendid programs to the best possible advantage of agriculture in America.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the attention given to this short summation on my part and I am sure whatever action is finally taken by the Congress will be to the best interest of the farmers of this great United States of America.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN. I would like to inquire of the gentleman when he would contemplate doing away with such loans as the Farmers' Home Administration issues. If we are ever going to discontinue socializing our economy, why would that not be a good place to start now?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I might say that there is a little fundamental difference between the gentleman and myself. I do not consider that program in any way as socialistic. I have seen that program take care of the farmers in my district who could not otherwise get credit. It makes loans to those who cannot get credit elsewhere. In addition, it makes loans to young veterans and it starts them along the road to a successful farming career. When these people get on their feet, they become good, worthwhile clients of the local banks and cease to obtain loans from the Farmers' Home Administration.

Please keep in mind that, regardless of what may have been said by people who do not understand this program, it

deals with people who have no other source of credit. If we were not to help out these people we would have a huge relief program upon our rolls instead. Here on the other hand we are giving these people an opportunity to help themselves. I am proud of the fact that 93 percent of the loans which have matured have been repaid by this group of people. I think it is a very worthwhile program and, as far as I am personally concerned, next to the price supports it is the most essential program in this bill.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I think it is wise at this time to point out that not only do we take people off the welfare lists through the wise administration and application of Farmers' Home Administration loans, but if we were to stop this program they would go back on the welfare lists in many cases.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There is no question about it, and we would have no way in which we could help our returning veterans. I think it is good, sound business.

Mr. HORAN. We not only try to work through this subcommittee as closely as possible with the administrator of these funds but we do insist that when they have proven their ability to handle these loans and have become successful they be taken off the Farmers' Home Administration rolls and seek credit elsewhere.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. In order to secure one of these loans the applicant must show that he does not have credit available from other sources. You are dealing with that class of people. Certainly the situation we found when we started this agency was not something to be proud of. I do not think this is socialism. I like to think I am against that. But if that be what this is, though I am sure it is not, it is good for the individuals and good for the country.

Mr. GWINN. I have heard that argument so long that we are virtually socializing our whole economy because it is the American variety of socialism and therefore it is good socialism.

My original question to the gentleman from Minnesota was, when is this type of crutch or the taking from one group and redistributing to others according to their needs going to be discontinued?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. First, let me disagree with that part of the gentleman's question as to redistribution. I will specifically answer the question as to when this crutch, as the gentleman calls it, will be done away with as far as the Congress of the United States is concerned. My answer would be never.

Mr. GWINN. Never? How much do we loan per year now under this administration?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We put \$162,500,000 for new loan money into this category, and it will not be many years before we have the same amount of money coming back as repayments on loans. This includes the \$35 million

program of loans for aid in buying farms. Most of that money goes to the veterans.

Mr. GWINN. Is not this administration the one that has the power to adjust or modify or even cancel these loans? Is it not a fact that in the election year something like 80,000 of these loans were modified or canceled?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the gentleman had examined into that he would have found that that had to do with the hundreds of thousands of loans that were made during the drought years back through the Midwest in 1934 to 1936. Those loans were made to various farmers. I remember in my community that hay worth \$6 a ton was brought in there and farmers were charged \$24 to \$30 a ton. Those loans have been considered direct charges against the farmer, whereas in the villages and the cities it was known as direct relief.

As time has gone by, it has been found necessary, where certain people who had moved off the farm, most of them getting up into their 60's—and after all, this is 20 years from that period—to give to the Farmers' Home Administrator the right to come in and compromise or cancel those loans. There was no possibility of collecting a good many of them.

In a good many instances, those laws were made during the drought period when all the farmers through that entire great area from Texas up to Minnesota practically went broke. Those loans should have been considered as direct relief, as was done in the villages and cities. But in this particular case they were made a direct charge against the farmers of America.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to point out that these were the old seed and feed loans of relief days, and the Farmers' Home Administration happened to be the agency which was saddled with the responsibility of handling it. It is not a part of the Farmers' Home Administration program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. As has been so well pointed out in this instance, they did have notes signed by the farmers, but the same thing done at the same time in the cities and municipalities was called direct relief. No payments were asked and none made. On the other hand, from the farmers they did take these notes. The other side of the picture is—after representatives of the Farmers' Home Administration collected all the money they felt they could without spending more money collecting it than they were receiving, after they had squeezed it down to the level where there was no reasonable return for the amount of money spent in trying to collect further, that is the point they reached when they finally decided to clear the books.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I know my former chairman would agree that in many, many cases more money was spent in attempting to collect the loans than the amount of money involved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman from Minnesota think that the Farmers' Home Administration program is any more socialistic in principle than the creation of a \$100 million fund by the House of Representatives a few days ago to indemnify bankers on loans made to exporters whose property is shipped overseas and has been confiscated or expropriated by some foreign dictator or some foreign government? Is that any more socialism than this sort of deal?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Of course, I would agree fully with the gentleman.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Gladly.

Mr. GWINN. Being a farmer myself, I have a high regard for the morals of farmers because I know something of them. It has been something of a sentimental notion of mine that perhaps because of that we could appeal to the farmers to get off the gravy train first as an example to the rest of the country, like the bankers in the city and those receiving public houses and loans and rent control. When are we going to start getting off the gravy train, if we do not start with the farmers?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not consider these great farm programs which have done so much for the good of the farm people of America as anything approaching socialism. My definition of such socialism is where you have any degree of compulsion. If the farmer is told that he must do certain things in order to do certain things, then you have something approaching socialism, which is in my mind the first cousin of communism, and from there it is only a step to a dictatorship; but there is no out-and-out compulsion in any of these programs having to do with agriculture, Mr. GWINN, and if there were, I would be the first one to get up here and fight against it. From that viewpoint, I cannot agree that there is anything that you might term socialism connected with what we have in this bill. I thank you.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, immediately after returning to Washington, and before inauguration of the new Eisenhower administration, I requested, from the Department of Agriculture, figures showing what agriculture prices in January 1952 were in relation to the last figures available, which was January 15, 1953.

The reason I requested these figures is that it had become obvious that the purchasing power of agriculture had steadily declined for a period of the past 2 years. In fact, the records show that from January 15, 1950, to January 15, 1953, agriculture prices had dropped, while the price of nearly all commodities had advanced until the purchasing power of the farmers have been reduced a total of 22 percent. I have found all

Members of Congress vitally concerned about this economic problem. The Congress must find a solution to this problem.

Here is the price picture for the major American crops, comparing the January 15, 1953, price to the farmer with the January 15, 1952, price:

Crop	1953	1952
Wheat.....bushel	\$2.10	\$2.20
Corn.....do	1.48	1.68
Cotton.....hundredweight	29.79	38.45
Potatoes.....bushel	2.06	2.07
Apples.....do	3.21	2.32
Beef.....hundredweight	19.70	27.20
Hogs.....do	17.80	17.40
Veal calf.....do	23.40	31.50
Lambs.....do	20.30	28.20
Chickens.....pound	.265	.274
Wool.....do	.51	.613
Milk.....hundredweight	4.80	5.14
Butterfat.....pound	.683	.798
Eggs.....dozen	.458	.405

The decline results from a number of fluctuations in the market. The farmer's real income has dropped steadily since World War II because retail prices have inched up and middleman costs have gone up. In the past year, a 30-percent drop in export of farm goods has increased the surplus, and cut into the rural income. This decline in exports was caused by increased production in other countries.

Individual commodities also have run into trouble. Beef is in a long cycle of increased production. Consequently, beef prices have fallen from 129 percent of parity to 92 percent in the year 1952.

The subnormal rainfall in the last 2 years has contributed greatly to the beef problem being serious in the southwestern States of our country. Shortage of feed and a declining market has forced many sales that otherwise would not have been made.

Mr. Chairman, in order to help maintain farm income on a parity with other segments of our economy, it is absolutely necessary that this administration and the Members of Congress give this problem their most careful and considered thought. Without a prosperous agriculture, we cannot have a prosperous country, and for that reason I intend to support the recommendations made by the Agriculture Committee and the Appropriations Committee dealing with that subject.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, the work of the subcommittee on the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture now before you has been long and arduous. I have had the privilege of working with a fine group of colleagues, whose integrity and sincerity I honor and whose opinions I respect. I do not always agree with them, but I know that the opinions they hold and express, while some of them may be different from my own, are sincerely and conscientiously arrived at. The friendship and courtesy they have extended to me leaves nothing to be desired.

The members of the subcommittee have made a sincere attempt to make a distribution of funds in this bill that will do the utmost toward helping solve some

of the important problems of agriculture. We have greatly benefited from the counsel of four members of the subcommittee with years of experience, broad knowledge, and a deep interest in agriculture—our chairman, H. CARL ANDERSEN, WALTER HORAN, CLARENCE CANNON, and JAMIE WHITTEN. Two new members of the subcommittee—OAKLEY HUNTER, of California, and MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin—have contributed much. The patient and untiring work of Ross Pope was invaluable to the subcommittee. It has been a pleasure to serve with these gentlemen. To have had the opportunity to work on problems so close to me as farming and farm families has given me great personal satisfaction.

It is with mixed feelings that I speak to the House today. It should not be necessary at this time to review in detail that part of our agricultural history which still lives vividly in the memory of every farmer who went through it. I am speaking of that period in the twenties when falling farm prices, forced sales, farm foreclosures, dark depression, dust storms, and bank failures brought a mighty nation to its knees.

It should not be necessary to review the tremendous comeback of agriculture and the onward push of farmers to the greatest productive effort the world has known. It should not be necessary to review the many basic agricultural laws which helped to make this great recovery possible—credit and conservation, research, and education, improved health and better diets for children, electric power and telephones, crop insurance and price supports. All of these have been provided for in the bill before you today. All of them have resulted in programs of established and proven benefit.

Mr. Chairman, this bill concerns the food on our table and the clothes on our backs. National security and human need have been our guide in drafting this bill. These are the only sound criteria that can be used for things so basic.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a curious change seems to have come over the Department of Agriculture in recent months. This was apparent throughout the hearings on this bill. It has been apparent in the speeches and pronouncements that have come from this great institution. It recalls to us the discarded and discredited policies of unhappier days which we thought were gathering dust in the files of failures. It is the philosophy that guided us into the last great depression.

It is the philosophy that there is something more important than national security and human need.

To paraphrase a well-known remark, we are told to lift our eyes beyond the dollar sign. That, Mr. Chairman, is exactly what your committee tried to do. Yet it is apparent that some in the Department of Agriculture have their eyes so closely fixed on the dollar that they have forgotten or ignored the national need. And this is precisely what the committee has attempted to correct in this bill.

Some responsible body, Mr. Chairman, must keep watch over the economic health and well-being of the country and

its people. If it is not the appointed officials, then it must be the elected officials.

I have said that it should not be necessary to review the history of agricultural decline, depression, and recovery. Perhaps I am wrong. There seem to be a number of responsible people who have learned nothing from having gone through this experience. Or, perhaps they are like the 17-year locust which spends most of its life buried and hidden away, then emerges to live for only a brief moment in the sunlight of reality.

On April 28, one of the appointed officials of the Department of Agriculture made a speech in Chicago. He started off this speech by saying, and I quote:

Last November the citizens of the United States by an overwhelming vote decided to redirect the course of the Nation.

Now I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman is as honest and sincere in this belief as he is wrong in his analysis. So far as the farmers of this country are concerned, the letters I have received from my friends and neighbors since November lead me to believe that the farmers intended that the progress would be forward, not backward. And the farmers seem to have a notion that the President shared their belief.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported out last Thursday. The following day, the same appointed official in the Department of Agriculture expressed the hope in a remark to a reporter that the Congress would disapprove this bill and be guided instead by the amounts submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

Now it is perfectly proper for an official of the Department to express this hope. I mention it only because it is indicative of an attitude that seems to persist over there.

It is the attitude that the duty of Congress is to support the Department of Agriculture. I hasten to say that Department officials have given repeated assurances that their only intention is to carry out the will of Congress. Yet, the opposite attitude continues to manifest itself in various ways. Appointed Department officials seem to have fixed notions as to the general type of programs that are best for the farmers. These officials seem to be very impatient with some of us who express disagreement with some of their ideas.

This was apparent in the hearings. As the hearings proceeded, it became quite clear that many of the responsible officials were in fundamental disagreement with many of the programs which the Congress has provided, and with many of the methods which Congress has authorized. The question naturally arises, Mr. Chairman, how can an administrative official do a good job in carrying out a program he does not believe in—no matter how sincere his intent or how earnest his effort?

Perhaps some of our fears are not justified, Mr. Chairman; I would hope so.

I would not like to see the time come when the question at issue is whether the Congress supports the Department of Agriculture, or the Department of Agriculture supports the Congress. I would

not like to see the time come when the Congress is putty in the hands of the Department of Agriculture, to be moulded to fit the whim and fancy of passing appointed officials.

I am ever grateful, Mr. Chairman, that our Founding Fathers had the foresight to provide for elected representatives through whom the people of this country can express their wishes. The voice of the people is being expressed, and it has been heeded by your committee.

There is another matter that came up during the hearings, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to dwell on briefly. It is this business of getting down to specific cases as to where we are going in agriculture; getting down to the point of whether we are going to change direction or not.

Many times during the hearings the subcommittee members have asked department officials specifically what they had in mind. What do you intend to do about conservation? What do you intend to do about price support? What do you intend to do about generation and transmission loans for REA? And so on down the line.

And in practically every instance we received the same reply. We have a committee working on that, Mr. Congressman, would be the answer. Or, we are going to get a committee to work on that. Or, we have that under study. Or, we have not had time to get into that; we need time for more study of that problem.

Now I am fully aware that it takes some time to work out new approaches to farm problems, and this is especially true if your intent is to change direction. But, bless my soul, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture is becoming one of the most profound study clubs in the land. I would like to recommend that while the Department is studying out the new kinds of farm programs, it also read up on the established and proven programs we have now, which the Congress, in its wisdom, has already provided.

While all this study is going on farm prices are going down, the export market is declining, and some surpluses are beginning to accumulate. Nero fiddled while Rome burned. Now we are asked to attend study seminars when we ought to be putting out the fire.

The President said at St. Cloud, Minn., on October 4, 1953:

Every kind of program adopted for the future would be farmer run, locally run.

This would seem to be a wise policy to follow. It is good to consult farmers on farm problems. But what has happened? We have agricultural advisory committees—one for nearly every important commodity and agricultural problem. The trouble is that on these committees the processors and the professors outnumber the farmers 2 to 1. I am afraid that the hand that is now guiding our great Department of Agriculture is not the hand of the farmer, but the hand of those who have traditionally farmed the farmer.

It is clear to me that if positive action is to be taken in behalf of agriculture,

that action must come from the Congress itself. And I wish to state, Mr. Chairman, that you could come to no better place than this Chamber to find men of good will, high courage, and sound judgment in the affairs of agriculture—and they sit on both sides of the aisle. There are men of both parties on this floor today who have been through this before. They are men who are close to the people, who have intimate knowledge of the problems of agriculture, and who are alert to reality. These men have forgotten more about farm problems, farm legislation, and farm programs than many can learn in a lifetime. It is to these men that agriculture must look today for constructive leadership.

Since being in Congress, I hope and feel that I have made friends among many of the Republican Members. I know that in many respects their beliefs are similar to mine. Mr. Chairman, my heart goes out to these Republican Members. I can well understand the concern and frustration they must feel at the curious behavior of some of the people they worked so hard to put in office. It gives me no pleasure as a Democrat to observe the unhappy predicament of my Republican friends. All I can say to these friends of mine is: Keep your chin up—we Democrats will see you through.

I think we should keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, that in this bill we are dealing with the only civilian department of Government that has had a succession of budget reductions over the last 12 years. This bill has been brought in for a Department that is facing some very serious problems which are the concern of city people as well as of farm people.

The great flow of production from our farms can be hindered or helped by the action this Congress takes.

Farming today is not an isolated business involving farmers alone. It is one involving close ties with business, industry, and jobs for workers. Nearly 2 out of every 5 people working in this country are either working on farms or in businesses and industries related to agriculture. Three great streams of employment flow from the soil. Ten million people in this country are working on farms. Six million more people are producing things and servicing the farmer. Nine million more people are processing and distributing farm products. These 25 million jobs are dependent in one way or another upon the health and wealth of our soil and the people on it.

This great industry is not to be approached in a small way. Too much is at stake in human values, in jobs for workers, and in the continued prosperity of our Nation.

Do you know of any place in the world where workers can buy as much food for each hour of labor as in the United States? Because of the progress farmers have made, an hour of factory work today will buy you more meat, more milk, more eggs, and more bread than the same hour of work would have purchased 13 years ago, or even 23 years ago.

We have no assurance that this present favorable situation will continue. It is an unpleasant fact to be faced that

danger signals are lighting up across the country.

Farm prices are going down, while farm costs are staying high. Net farm income for this year is estimated at a billion or more dollars below that of 1952. The buying power of this income, which helps to keep the machines humming and the men and women working in the towns and cities, is the lowest since 1941.

Farmers are spending \$4 for production today for every dollar they had to spend during World War II. A farmer starting today needs at least \$3 for every dollar he had to have 15 years ago. The volume of industrial goods used in farm production today is $2\frac{1}{4}$ times that of the average before the last great war. Farmers are using $3\frac{1}{2}$ times the tonnage of fertilizers. Farmers are using 4 times the tonnage of liming materials. Farmers are now spending $\$3\frac{1}{2}$ billion a year for all kinds of farm machinery and equipment to keep production high. All of this means jobs in the towns and cities and money in the pay envelopes, and food and education for the children, and maybe a little something to put away for a time of sickness or retirement from active work.

Agriculture reminds me of the fable about the goose that laid the golden eggs. It spreads prosperity throughout the land every year. It is not a critically sick goose yet, but it is ailing. The proper treatment is not to cut off its head or starve it to death—or even to worry it into a state of collapse.

One of the very important items in this bill, Mr. Chairman, is the one dealing with conservation. I should like to point out that as the Benson budget came over to us, more than three-fourths of the total cut in regular annual appropriations had been taken out of conservation activities. There are some on this floor who feel that the funds proposed for the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service are too much. I do not question their sincerity, Mr. Chairman, but I deplore their judgment.

I do not wish to belabor the point, but I want to express the firm belief that \$195 million for vital conservation work is small enough. In fact, last year the taxpayers of this country paid \$192 million in subsidies to receive third-class circular mail.

Every authority appearing before our subcommittee testified to the decline in productivity of much of our richest farming land. This has been going on for 30 years. It is still going on. It will continue to go on until adequate corrective measures are taken.

We are dealing with a program that involves our future food production. Other members have very ably pointed out the increased food requirements we will be facing in a comparatively short time. The cost of shortage is far greater than the cost of providing abundance. An increase of only 1 cent a pound in the cost of all the domestically produced food we eat in a year would cost the taxpayers $\$2\frac{1}{2}$ billion—more than 10 times the cost of this program.

We are nowhere near meeting our yearly conservation needs. At the rate

we are now going it will take 30 years to do a once-over conservation job on the farms of this country. With all of the progress that has been made, we are still taking out of the soil each year twice the volume of plant nutrients we are putting back. At the rate we are going now it will be 10 to 12 years before the gains from conservation are equal to the annual losses from soil deterioration.

One of the soil authorities testifying before our subcommittee made a remark worth remembering.

"When we get a little hungry," he said, "we will pay more attention to this job."

I would hate to feel, and I do not feel, Mr. Chairman, that the decision of this Congress will be to wait until we get a little hungry. I do not believe that the farmers of this country put us in office to provide a stretchout program for conservation such as proposed by the Department of Agriculture.

In the conservation sign-up campaign for this year, farmers indicated, as brought out in the hearings, that they would like to carry out practices totaling more than three times the amount that can be provided in this bill. In actual conservation assistance on the land, this program will provide only \$112 million in 1954. As the able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has said, "This is not a payment to a man to stick into his pocket. It is a contribution as a part of what he actually put back into the land." The \$112 million in actual work represents only one-third of the total cost. The farmers will more than double this amount in cash costs and labor.

If we were attempting to provide for a total conservation job, based on annual needs as determined by the States, it would take an appropriation seven and one-half times the amount provided in this bill. No one is advocating such an expenditure.

During the period in which farm production climbed highest we had the incentive of a rising price level and high net income for agriculture. What assurances do farmers have today that the price structure will remain favorable? Any slackening in our effort now—any stretchout of this much needed work—means falling further behind.

Conservation is not something that can be set aside to be taken up at a more convenient time. Erosion and soil loss go on day in and day out, year after year. The rate of gain in conservation should, in the national interest, at least keep pace with the rate of soil decline.

When it comes to a matter as important as food, it is the need which should be our guide. This is a case, Mr. Chairman, where the national interest demands that we lift our eyes beyond the dollar sign. This is a case where we can afford to subordinate the dollar to human need.

In another part of this bill, your committee has restored \$2½ million in production and subsistence loans for the Farmers' Home Administration. The record of the Farmers' Home Administration is outstanding. But with the funds available, it has been unable to help more than 35 percent of the applicants for loans. It should be remembered

that families who apply for loans from this agency cannot obtain credit from any other source. This program has the support of bankers and businessmen.

On the average, participants turn to other credit agencies after they have had Farmers' Home Administration loans for about 3½ years even though mortgages are drawn for 7 years.

Since it has been indicated that it will not be necessary to use as much money for subsequent loans to present borrowers, it would be possible to help about 800 more families in the next fiscal year. The repayment record of borrowers of this agency shows that less than 4 percent of the total amount loaned will be written off as a loss to the taxpayer. Production and subsistence loans are the first steps toward strengthening family-type farms.

Mr. Chairman, your committee recommends \$135 million for REA loans and a modest expansion of \$15 million in rural telephone loans in this bill. The \$50 million for telephone loans is the amount requested by the Department of Agriculture. There are approximately \$100 million in telephone loan applications now pending in REA. This is an important program. According to the 1950 census, less than 2 out of 5 American farms had telephone service of any kind. From the evidence brought out at the hearings, your committee feels that this bill will provide for an orderly development of this work.

Your committee did not feel that it would be wise to approve a stretch-out program for rural power. The loan funds for REA represent an investment in national growth and national security. This money will be returned to the Treasury with interest. Loan repayments are well ahead of schedule.

Approximately 11 percent of American farms are still without electric service. More than 1,000 REA borrowers serve nearly 4 million farm people and operate over 1,200,000 miles of line. Over half of these lines are more than 5 years old. The point has been reached where it is essential that adequate maintenance programs are carried out to assure continued and reliable service to farmers, and to protect the Government's investment. There are about \$2 billion in loans outstanding. Heavy repayments will be coming due in the next few years.

Power requirements are increasing. Power shortages still exist in some areas. Farmers last year used more than 17 billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy. This is more power than is used by four of our large industrial centers in a year.

The power requirements of REA borrowers alone last year were 13½ billion kilowatt-hours. And it is estimated that REA borrowers alone will need about 20 billion kilowatt-hours by 1955—an increase of nearly 50 percent in 3 years.

Every dollar invested in bringing electricity to a farm multiplies itself 3 or 4 times in additional business to the local communities and towns. This program has created at least \$8 billion worth of initial new business, strictly as a by-product of bringing farmers central station service.

Most of the power now purchased by rural families is used in the home, for this is the first place it is needed. Great

additional benefits can be realized in the future from an expansion in the use of electricity for increased farm production.

Mr. Chairman, it has been the policy of REA to make sufficient loan funds available to electric cooperatives that they can meet the needs for expansion of systems so long as they show satisfactory evidence of being able to repay.

It has also been the policy to make loans for generation and transmission of electric power. This is an important point. It is one of the main reasons that the average cost of power to REA borrowers has come down one-fifth since 1941.

I am sure that the Congress desires to take no action which would weaken the ability of REA cooperatives to meet the expanding requirements for rural power, or to obtain favorable rates for farm families.

Mr. Chairman, your committee has restored the drastic cut recommended in the Benson budget for the school-lunch program. This program is helping to provide better diets for our school children. It encourages the use of dairy products, meats, and other good wholesome foods.

This program is operating in 55,700 schools. There are only about 3,000 schools in the country which have lunch programs of their own. Ten million school children are receiving the benefit of this program—nearly a third of the total enrollment in elementary and high schools. Enrollment in schools is now increasing at the rate of about 1½ million children a year, compared with a rate of 800,000 in 1951.

The funds appropriated for this program all go for the purchase of food. Between 80 and 90 percent of the food used by the schools is purchased locally. When the purchases of more than 55,000 schools are added together, they represent a large market. This year schools will spend about \$270 million for local purchases of food.

To reduce the funds for this program, as proposed in the Benson budget, might well increase the price of the lunch to many school children and limit participation in this important program. The States are now putting \$3 into this program for every \$1 the Federal Government contributes.

Mr. Chairman, your subcommittee on agricultural appropriations has worked long hours to bring you a bill that meets the needs of the Nation. We have been ever mindful of the state of the Nation's finances. We have tried to make every penny do a job of utmost importance. We recognize the need for bare-bone economy, as well as the need for wise economy which makes every dollar work for us. We have tried to provide the means by which programs for the growth and development of agriculture can be carried forward. Let me remind you that a balanced budget over a period of years will depend largely upon a thriving agriculture from which flows the raw materials of production and the sources of employment.

In a world of enduring peace, the goods of a productive agriculture are weapons in the continuing fight on poverty, hunger, and disease. In peace and

war, agriculture has served the Nation well. It remains the backbone of our might and seeks only to serve us with the food and materials we need to build strength against enemies, and to raise even higher a standard of living already unbelievable to millions in great areas of the world.

The productive capacity of American agriculture did not just happen. It was built by men of faith and foresight. It was built by the ceaseless labor of farm families striving always to improve the resources and methods of production. Government to them is not an autocratic landlord doling out undeserved relief; it is a working partner paid out of their taxes and serving them in honest return. The farmer is a citizen first and shares fully in the common fate of the Nation; he is not separate from Government but a part of it.

George Washington knew this when he said:

I know of no pursuit in which more real and important service can be rendered to any country than the improvement of its agriculture.

This has been the sole and overriding desire of your subcommittee—to serve our country by helping to improve our agriculture. We present this bill to you with pride in our work and with the humble hope that you too will appreciate its importance to the future of these United States.

I now yield to my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. I asked the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota to yield for the purpose of complimenting him, not only as an individual but also the members of the subcommittee, for the restoration of the proposed cut in the school-lunch program. I think it was an excellent job, and I hope the committee and the Congress will approve the subcommittee's action.

Mr. MARSHALL. I appreciate the gentleman's compliments, and I assure him that if I had known he was asking me to yield for that purpose I would most willingly have yielded.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Is there anything in this bill in reference to the appropriation for funds for land-utilization projects which were begun a number of years ago by the Government and which are being maintained as land-utilization projects?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe the answer to that would be \$1,248,000.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to this fact: There are a great many of these projects which are more than self-sustaining. For instance, in my district we have two of these projects which pay a very liberal return to the Government of the United States. I do not think there is anything in the report—at least, there is nothing that I see—which shows the Government is getting the money back or that money is being placed in the Treasury and shown as a credit offset on the amount of money that is paid.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The chairman of this subcommittee will inform the gentleman that in a good many places throughout this bill there are offsetting receipts. For example, in the Forest Service there are considerable receipts from timber sales. Were we to take credit for all such receipts as offsets, the size of the bill would be considerably less.

Furthermore, in reference to the school-lunch program, that \$83,350,000 should properly not be charged against agriculture. That appropriation is for the benefit of the schoolchildren of America. The members of this subcommittee have thought more about the welfare of the schoolchildren of America than trying to make a record as far as this particular bill is concerned.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I think, however, it could well be taken into consideration in estimating the cost of the farm program when some of the money is being returned as in the case of the land-utilization projects. One more question, if I may inquire further of the gentleman: Is there any study being made now which the gentleman knows of by the Department of Agriculture in reference to the dust storms we are having now throughout the Middle West? I recently experienced the discomfort of flying through one of those duststorms. The dust was being blown out of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and other States in that area. The entire air was just laden with this dust moving from these areas. I know it is doing a great deal of harm to those areas. Is any study or any effort being made to offset that?

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman, I am sure, is aware that over the years the soil-conservation work being done attacks that problem. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is raising the question.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I think it is extremely important.

Mr. MARSHALL. Many times people feel when we talk about soil conservation, we are only dealing with the water problem. The conservation of our land from the standpoint of wind erosion is as important, if not more so than other types of erosion.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The time has come when this country has to do something about wind erosion.

Mr. MARSHALL. I do know that many of the practices carried out, that protect the soil from wind erosion, are also those same practices that assist in times of flood dangers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] raises a very valid point. On page 464 of the hearings you will find a chart which I had inserted in the Record. In fact, I compiled it myself from information supplied by several departments. It shows the amount of work and the amount of money that is being spent on range re-vegetation, where a lot of your dust

comes from. This bill also carries \$5 million with which we propose to set up pilot plants to study watershed flood prevention, which will work in that direction. If you have studied soil conservation work, you will know that where you have a good district, the wind can pass over those farms with a minimum of erosion from the wind. I would say that permeating this bill we have a great many programs, which this bill supplies, which work in the direction of stopping that which you complain about.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman. Let me say to the gentleman our problem in Louisiana is not one of wind erosion. We often have too much water in my State; but I flew over areas at least a thousand miles away from those wind-eroded areas, and I found the sky 5 miles up laden with dust. I know it is blown up there from the whole countryside in some areas. It is a serious question. I am making a serious study of this most important problem.

Mr. HORAN. I wish the gentleman would study this chart which I mention, because in addition to the Department of Agriculture we have the biggest of these landholdings in the Department of the Interior. We also have landholdings owned by the armed services. As far as the clouds and skies and study of the jet streams are concerned, which we discovered in 1944, experiments are now going on in the State of Washington, conducted by the weather bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with my two friends from Minnesota in the things they have said about the rest of this subcommittee and our clerk, Ross Pope.

I want to talk today generally, in this general debate, about the place of American agriculture, and perhaps to relate it to world peace and what we may be able to do in that direction. I think I shall have some interesting statistics for you and will try to prove to you why it is so essential that we maintain a healthy agriculture here in this good earth of ours, which is the last best hope of men for peace, I think.

Every weekend or so my colleagues have been going out to Las Vegas, Nev., where continuing billion-dollar atomic experiments are on display. There is drama in it. It defies all conscience, and we are left bewildered, stunned, impressed.

Today, our subcommittee brings before you a simple bill. In direct appropriations it is less than last year's budget. It deals with bread—common, real—no more dramatic than the old shoes you threw away last week—much less dramatic than atom bombs. And yet, humble though it may be, food is also a definite factor in a lasting peace. And because we are a nation seeking a lasting peace, I am thankful for the opportunity, along with my colleagues on this subcommittee, to talk with you about the work of a great Department of this Gov-

ernment of ours. I speak of the Department of Agriculture.

We are not Greeks bearing gifts for the world. We are simple Americans going about our free way of life—productive, well meaning, and neighborly. We bring to you today a supply bill to enable our Department of Agriculture to continue on through fiscal 1954. These are necessary funds. How necessary and how cheap is the investment we here propose to make.

We live in a world of some 2,400,000,000 persons. Our best available statistics indicate that since the end of World War II our ability to produce food in this world has increased only some 9 percent—our population is increasing at the rate of 12 percent, leaving a deficit of caloric intake around the globe. This world skates on thin ice in the matter of food. Today the National Research Council reports that the average calories daily consumed by various peoples in certain areas around the globe border dangerously on the slow-starvation side.

Figures of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Service, which include staples such as wheat, rice, and the principal crops, as well as supplemental food items such as vegetables and fruits, are:

	Calories	Remarks
Southeast Asia.....	1,800-2,200.....	Serious.
North Asia.....	1,900-2,300.....	Do.
Near East.....	2,200-2,400.....	Do.
North Africa.....	2,000-2,300.....	Do.
South Africa.....	2,420.....	Borderline of need.
South America.....	2,250-3,090.....	Ample.
Northern Europe ¹	2,400-3,200.....	Do.
North America.....	3,130.....	Do.
U. S. S. R.....	2,800.....	Do.

¹ Deficiencies exist in Danube Valley.

Living, as we do, in a world of bombs and bread, I feel that it is particularly timely and important as we today consider our appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, to once more refresh our memories with relation to the work this Department is doing—and also to envisage the work this bill will enable it to accomplish during fiscal 1954.

To me, I feel that it is well for us to realize the entire import of what our Nation and our neighbor to the North—Canada—mean in terms of hunger wherever you may find it.

Hunger knows no law, sacred or civil. In Starvation, Truths, Half-Truths, and Untruths, written by Frank Pearson and Don Paarlberg in 1946—Mr. Paarlberg is now an Assistant to Secretary Benson—they say:

Throughout history, hunger has known no law. The pressure of population on the food supply caused the more powerful groups of men to raid or seize the fertile valleys, plains or countries from their better fed, though weaker, neighbors. History records that many different races raided the fertile valleys of the Euphrates, the Nile, the Danube, the Rhine, the Volga, and the Yangtze. The natives of the Scotch highlands raided the lowlands to the south. The Pilgrims, driven by hunger, raided the food supplies of the Indians. Sometimes these raiders were small groups of men and sometimes they were armies of millions. They sought more meat, more grain, or more living space.

In the known history of man, famines, whether caused by weather, war, or greeds to which man is heir, have caused

widespread suffering, migrations, political upheavals and death. Our earliest record of a famine is some 2,000 years before the time of Abraham. And still with all our vaunted progress, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations estimates that half of the world's 2.4 billion inhabitants are today on seriously insufficient diets. Perhaps the worst areas of famine are those which depend upon the seasonal rains, the monsoons, and so forth, where failure of the weather can bring widespread suffering to thickly populated areas which depend upon such weather for the production of their food.

No exact chronology of all the world's famines in the last 4,000 years is at hand, but of the great famines of history undoubtedly somewhere between 600 and 700 can be authenticated from the beginning of our records until the present day. It is estimated that 50 percent of Chinese mortality is directly or indirectly caused by chronic malnutrition, and the University of Nanking lists 1,829 famines in the last 2,000 years for China alone. We know that famines are frequently mentioned in the Old Testament. We know that famines occurred in Rome during the height of her so-called prosperity. We know that Europe all through the years has had her famines with the consequent effects.

As late as the early Middle Ages, cannibalism was not uncommon even in Western Europe. In Scotland, after 4 years of famine in A. D. 936, we are told that people began to devour one another. During the Irish famine of 963 and 964, parents sold their children for food. We are told that severe and extended famines of the years preceding 1095 were a contributive cause of the First Crusade and that Pope Urban II, in a speech at Clermont, referred to the land of France as "too narrow for its dense population; nor does it abound in wealth; and it furnishes scarcely food enough for its cultivators. Hence it is that you murder and devour one another, that you wage war." The Crusades made a potent economic appeal to the peasantry of Europe, especially of France.

The first 400 years of the second millennium since Christ saw many famines throughout Europe and throughout the world. They followed the trail of the Tartars of Genghis Kahn and the armies of other conquerors and would-be conquerors in the world.

Of all the great famines in India and in Asia, the famine in Bengal, India, in 1770 ranks among the most destructive. A third of the population, 10 million people, perished, and entire communities were wiped out. When new crops came forth, they often had no owners. Again in India, even after the industrial revolution, a great famine occurred in 1876-78 and 5 million persons perished from famine in Bombay, Madras, and Mysore. At the same time, there was a severe famine in North China where 9½ million people are said to have perished. That's only some 75 years ago.

With the coming of the industrial revolution, of course, and the rapid growth of railroads, steamships, and

other means of transportation in the 19th century, outright famine in time of peace has been more generally avoided in the highly developed industrial areas of the world.

The great famine in Ireland in 1846-47 caused a death toll of over a million persons and resulted in tremendous migrations to the United States. All told, Ireland's population was reduced as a result of this famine by 2½ million. This gives us a new concept of the effect of famine when migration is possible. It also brings clearly to us our responsibility as producers and the need to facilitate more speedily the transportation of food from areas of production to areas of want.

However, the industrial revolution has presented some interesting paradoxes. It has been reported that in the Indian famine of 1876-78, which has been mentioned earlier, while 5 million people were dying of hunger, the exports of cereals through the port of Calcutta never stopped.

The cures of famine, of course, are obvious. We must reclaim more land, we must drain our swamps in order to increase the land available for cultivation, and, further we must take advantage of new and improved means of agriculture production. We must have new crops, new hybrids, improved breeds of animals, etc. In many parts of the world, improvement in land holding regulations and in methods of taxation will result in increased production. We must take care of the soil, conserve it, fertilize it and improve its consistency.

According to the FAO, in its second world food supply survey published last November, the following is true:

Many of the present significant patterns of food production, trade, and consumption, if they did not altogether originate from the Second World War, have at any rate taken clearer shape as a result. The low level of food production in the underdeveloped areas of the world, and the wide disparities between food consumption in these areas and in the more advanced countries have long been recognized as outstandingly serious aspects of the world's food and agricultural situation. The effect of the Second World War was to aggravate these problems acutely. Territories were laid waste not only in Europe, but also in the Far East. Destruction of livestock, farm machinery, and farm buildings, storage and processing facilities was on an immense scale; soil reserves and sometimes agricultural manpower were seriously reduced. Most of the prolific fishing grounds were closed and the best craft were converted to war purposes. Important sources of supply and markets were cut off from each other. The immense burden of supplying the Allied Powers with food and other requisites for the war effort fell upon the few areas in which supplies were accessible, especially those in which output could be expanded rapidly. In this way, the main features of the postwar dependence of large areas of the world on the surpluses of North America and Oceania emerged. The history of the world food situation during

the postwar years is essentially that of an arduous struggle to increase agricultural and other output all over the world, and to restore some balance in the patterns of production and international trade. The struggle is still continuing, its successful issue obstructed by political disturbances, by repeated foreign exchange crises and by recurrent shortages of raw materials and other means of production.

The world continues to be in a precarious balance as far as the adequacy of its food supply is concerned.

The following conclusion from the May 1952 issue of *Fortune* magazine may, however, be as sound a one as can be found at the present juncture of world history:

The world faces, as it always has, an endless struggle to feed itself, today and tomorrow. It would be disastrous for man to assume that a solution is inevitable, that he can sit back and wait for science to supply it. But there is no reason for energetic and ingenious men to despair.

As my colleague from Minnesota has pointed out, we do not propose in this bill to weaken, in any way, our American agriculture.

The measure also indicates some new accents that, to me, are truly sources of hope.

First, we propose a new direction for a wiser use of funds for flood prevention. This, to those areas of the United States which suffer from excessive spring runoffs of water or from flash floods, is truly an important program. Moreover, it holds some promise of watershed and water conservation that can, in the future, be of immense importance.

In periods of drought, the retention of these waters held on the watersheds in the spring can be a source of real salvation. The floods which we have experienced in Kansas, Texas, California, and elsewhere in the Nation make an active consideration of this principle of conservation no longer avoidable.

The second accent which this bill carries is that of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Service. One of the first acts of Secretary Benson was to make this into one of the major divisions of the Department of Agriculture and change its name from the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations to that of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Service. A trade promotion program is being set up and at long last we in the United States are going out to reassert our historical place in world agriculture markets. The importance of this is at once apparent, for we are a productive nation. We must remain productive, and rather than worry about the existence of surplus, we should rejoice that we do have surpluses and go energetically about the business of getting these surpluses into the stomachs of hungry people everywhere.

I trust that the Congress and the committee will appreciate our responsibilities in this matter of food, and thus make it possible to promote the movement of our surplus agriculture stocks into every land.

Perhaps one of the most illustrative programs that today exists is that of the international wheat agreement which

was recently reentered into on a 3-year basis. It illustrates the picture which we have in the world today. Some 45 nations of the free world are party to it. Four of those nations are classed as exporters of wheat. Forty-one are listed as importers and, yet, of the 4 exporters, only 2 are important—Canada and the United States. Australia is listed as an exporter but the present favorable world price of wool has led her producers to go into wool production rather than grain growing. France is listed as an exporter but her contribution is so small as to be almost insignificant.

In this program we loom large. We contribute some 275 million bushels of wheat each year. The new agreement carries a higher ceiling price than the one first entered into in 1948. When we talk of people, let us not forget that bread is far more important than bombs.

It was my pleasure about a year ago to attend the international wheat agreements and when I saw people from Asia, rice-eating nations, actively represented in the international wheat agreements and wanting our wheat, I knew then that there was a place for the United States in any arena where we work for a lasting peace. This is one of the programs that is today of such immense importance.

We must remain productive, for even in our own country, as has been so graphically pointed out, our population is likewise increasing.

It is now estimated that there will be 195 million people in the United States by 1975. Last year's estimate was 190 million people by 1975. That is just 22 years away.

The 195 million figure is equal to our present population, plus the present populations of the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and New Jersey.

To feed these 195 million folks, the 28.4 billion pounds of meat necessary to supply today's menu will require:

Pork: Today's production, plus the present production from Nebraska and Iowa;

Beef: Today's production, plus the present production from Oklahoma, Texas, and Minnesota;

Lamb and mutton: Today's production, plus the present production from Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, and Montana.

In terms of milk and eggs, the figures are astounding:

Milk: Today's production, plus the present production of Wisconsin, Michigan, Vermont, and Illinois;

Eggs: Today's production, plus the present production from California, Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Vermont.

Some way we must find and wheel into our production line, 115 million acres. That is more than the combined productive fertile fields of today's States of Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio.

Some way we are going to feed those people. We do not agree with the Mal-

thusian premise that famine, war, and pestilence bring about an inevitable leveling of population in terms of available food production.

Today we have some 462 million productive acres. From these acres we feed our present population amply and have 40 million acres for export. We need 115 million more, for it is estimated that we will need 577 million acres to feed our own population in 1975.

From irrigation and drainage, we can see an additional 45 million acres. Conservation and other types of reclamation, including more and wiser use of chemicals and fertilizers must supply the rest.

Our Nation needs to save what we have and to bring into full production everything that can be reclaimed. Our Nation needs it and since the world's population is increasing at the rate of 12 percent, while world food production is increasing at only 9 percent, the world needs it also.

Hunger knows no law and history records that hunger means invasions, war, and death.

It could happen here if we lose vision.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his very constructive talk. I think it was a real contribution on the subject under discussion today. The gentleman has evidently given this much study.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I would like to add my compliments on the splendid statement of the gentleman. I think he has given much thought to these important problems. He mentioned in the course of his fine speech the famines throughout history and our growing population. In view of these facts, may I ask the gentleman for his comments upon the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service?

In view of the fact that there is need for the production of more and more food, and we do not have the land, is not the best means of assuring such greater production, the conservation of our soil?

Mr. HORAN. I want the gentleman to know that we gave a great deal of thought to that. The additional \$5 million which we have put in the bill under flood prevention work will also be administered by the Soil Conservation Service. I can envisage, as the gentleman can, that this division of the Department of Agriculture still has a big job ahead of it. That is conservation on water sheds, but that is also an important form of conservation, as was brought out by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks]. I think as far as soil conservation appropriations are concerned, they are not forming new districts as fast as they anticipated, and that is the reason for the amount in the bill.

Mr. EVINS. It is the gentleman's view then that the reductions that have been made will be offset by increases in conservation in the watershed field?

Mr. HORAN. I think so, and we hope so. At least our subcommittee are in agreement on that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may make further reply to the gentleman's inquiry?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Washington is entirely correct when he says that the new districts have not come in as anticipated. In fact, for fiscal 1953 we made sufficient money available for 2,640 districts, as of March 1, 2,502 had been organized. Forty more are expected by June 30. Consequently, the 100 or more anticipated for this coming fiscal year will be more than taken care of in what we made available last year. Hence, you will see no increase for the first time in many years on this particular program, but all districts will be well taken care of.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. I congratulate the gentleman on the very fine and graphic presentation he has made of the problems of agriculture, as he has stated them today. I am only sorry that more Members of the House are not present to hear the gentleman because I think what he has said is very much worthwhile, and something we need to know more about, and something that we need to try to look into in the future in an effort to solve these problems. I think the gentleman has done a very fine job.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in bringing you this appropriation bill as so frequently happens, it does not represent in its entirety my own personal views, nor, I am sure, does it represent the views of any individual member of the committee in its entirety. But I do feel that we have brought a bill here which represents a composite of the views of the entire membership of the committee. It is a bill which I expect to support because I think it is a good bill. I served, as you know, for 4 years as chairman of this subcommittee, and during that time I had the wholehearted cooperation of the two fine Republican members of that committee, the present chairman, Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN, and Hon. WALTER HORAN. They are informed, able Members of Congress. We brought out a joint bill during those 4 years. We have now had added to the committee the gentleman from California, Hon. ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER, and the gentleman from Wisconsin, Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD. On the Democratic side, we have had added

to our subcommittee Hon. FRED MARSHALL from Minnesota. All are outstanding Members of Congress. I want to say to you I do not know how you could have selected men with more interest in agriculture, and who have made a greater contribution to the hearings and the handling of this matter within the subcommittee. I wish to join in the statements about our executive clerk, Ross Pope. There is no finer.

There are a number of items in this bill, which I think perhaps I should mention here. First, and I think I should answer it—we are reading in the press or at least I have and I have had a number of telephone calls where they point out that a news story carried the report that this bill was \$100 million above the budget recommended by Secretary Benson. First, that is not true. Secondly, in their news story they counted loan authorizations as part of the operating expenses of the Department. Whoever heard of counting the loans made by a bank as part of the operating expenses?

If you have heard of that, whoever heard of reporting loan authorizations as a part of the annual operating costs? And if you were going to count those loan authorizations as an annual cost in this bill, why not give the Department credit then for the money collected from selling timber, which amounts to something more than \$40 million? Why not give the Department credit for the millions of dollars which it collects annually on loans heretofore made, and from fees? Such funds go into the general receipts of the Treasury. If you are going to list loan authorizations as an annual charge, why not delete from this bill the amount of money that we spent in Mexico on the foot-and-mouth disease? Why do you not delete from the charge against appropriations for this Department the \$83,300,000 which is furnished for the school-lunch program? I do not mean to do away with the school-lunch program, but why charge it to this appropriation?

I mention these things because those of us who have a sincere regard for agriculture have tried to do a good job in holding down expenses in this Department to these bare essentials.

THE FACTS

The facts are these: The appropriation for the Department of Agriculture in this bill is \$24,301,505 less than the appropriation last year. The appropriations for the Department of Agriculture are 30.7 percent less than in 1940. Personnel in the Department of Agriculture, under the terms of this bill, are 38.1 percent less than in 1940. I would like to point out that so far as the rest of the Government is concerned, for the present fiscal year appropriations for all activities of the Government, exclusive of national defense and atomic energy, are 139 percent above 1940; and the number of Federal employees engaged in the operations of the Government, exclusive of national-defense items, are 126 percent above 1940.

BELIEF IN BALANCING THE BUDGET

I believe in balancing the budget, but feel it should be balanced where it has become unbalanced; and that is largely with regard to the activities of the Government where the great increases have been made.

RECORD FOR ECONOMY

Mr. Chairman, since I have made a real fight for adequate attention to American agriculture and expect to support this bill to the limit of my ability, I think I have a right to say that I will compare my record for economy in Government with anyone in Congress. Unlike some who have gotten lots of credit by talking about how large the Federal Government is and how many employees it has, but who stop there, I know I have done something about it and feel justified in pointing out some of my affirmative actions for economy which have been incorporated into law since I have been a Member of this Congress.

ELK HILLS

In the first full term served in the Congress raised the question of legality of the lease of oil reserves by the Navy, got an appropriation held up, preventing the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars. The Secretary of Navy insisted I was wrong. However, my actions were approved by the Department of Justice. Later Secretary Knox came in to say he had pulled a "boner."

NAVY USE OF VACANT ARMY BASES

When the Navy attempted to secure over \$300 million for new facilities, managed to get Army witnesses before our Navy subcommittee and found that during the 4 years of the war there has been no meeting of the joint committee on use of facilities. The Army had said it had no facilities to make available to the Navy because the Navy asked for abandoned facilities, and the Army called them vacated. We used more than 169 vacated Army facilities by the Navy, saving more than \$300 million. For this I received the commendation of Secretary Forrester.

FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING

When it developed that the Federal Public Housing Authority had twice as many of its people in salary brackets above \$5,000 a year as other agencies of Government, wrote the language limiting the agency to not more than 20 percent of their force in that category.

INLAND WATERWAYS

When it developed that the employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation were absolutely strangling the Corporation by their "featherbedding" and other practices, gave them the benefit of civil service and when they attempted to follow their former activities they found that under civil service they could not strike against the Government. Such provision saved that activity and much money besides, and is still carried in the act.

AMERICAN SPRUCE CORPORATION

Was the acting head of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Government Corporations which discovered the Ameri-

can Spruce Corporation had existed since World War I at an annual cost of thousands of dollars to the Government, but had done nothing and actually no one even had a record of it. We abolished it.

INVESTIGATIONS AND CORRECTIONS

In 1950 was author of provision of law requiring regular departments of Government to meet wartime needs with regular personnel and funds.

RESOLUTION 10

Mr. Chairman, I was the author of Resolution 10, of the Appropriations Committee, passed last year, as follows:

Resolved, That it shall be the policy of the Appropriations Committee that the programs and budget estimates of each department or agency shall be inspected and checked by investigators of the Appropriations Committee each year; and

The appropriate subcommittee may direct the particular phases to which special attention shall be given.

The present administration is proceeding under that resolution now.

LIMITATIONS ON PERSONNEL

Mr. Chairman, it was my amendment, Public Law 253, section 1310, and Public Law 375, section 1302, which limited the total number of permanent Federal employees to that of September 1, 1950; provides for orderly promotions; requires a report annually to the Congress as to the annual grade and salary in each bureau and agency. We did not have such provision in World War II and ended up with an extra expenditure of \$2 billion a year as a result. By reason of this law, which the Congress adopted, experts estimate that the Government is saved an amount exceeding one-half billion dollars a year.

When we had the Joint Committee on the Budget—made up of members of Appropriations and Tax Committees of the House and Senate—I offered the resolution to set aside a percentage of our annual income for application on the principal of the national debt. When the Democrats were in the majority on that special committee, I got the vote of all the Republicans. When the Republicans were in the majority, I got the votes of the Democratic minority. Both recognized the soundness of the approach. However, I failed to get the resolution adopted.

OTHER ACTS FOR ECONOMY

A few years ago led the fight in the Appropriations Committee to reduce foreign economic aid programs by 15 percent. This was adopted.

Wrote a provision requiring that before nitrogenous fertilizer could be shipped overseas, the Department of Agriculture had to make a survey and certify there were sufficient quantities left for the American users.

Last year, when it developed that through the foreign-aid programs, in many instances, we were providing the money through grants to foreign countries and they selling our own commodities below cost to us in exchange for our own money, wrote the provision of law which prohibits continuation of such program. This saves us much money

and in addition will have the effect of firming up prices for American commodities, as against using our own money through foreign aid to drag down prices for American producers.

All this in addition to individual votes for reductions in appropriations.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

You may say, "How about agriculture?" Let us see the record:

Comparison of appropriations and employment of Department of Agriculture with other civilian departments and agencies (regular annual appropriations)

Department	Fiscal year 1940		Fiscal year 1953		Percentage increase or decrease	
	Appropriations	Employment	Appropriations	Employment	Appropriations	Employment
Agriculture	\$1,054.9	91,370	\$733.8	57,935	-\$30.4	-38.7
Commerce	54.2	26,690	797.2	65,172	+1,370.8	+144.1
Interior	191.2	46,547	545.5	60,677	+185.3	+30.3
Justice	152.6	14,720	184.4	32,194	+250.6	+118.7
Labor	34.6	3,484	222.5	7,815	+543.0	+124.3
Post Office	794.0	303,654	2,708.8	523,779	+251.8	+72.4
State	21.0	6,302	261.7	31,302	+1,146.1	+396.7
Treasury	215.9	59,256	655.5	89,460	+203.6	+50.9
Independent offices	3,301.9	77,160	5,100.9	273,760	+54.4	+254.8
Other offices and agencies	1,469.1	120,269	4,126.8	357,919	+180.9	+197.6
Total (excluding Agriculture)	6,134.5	658,091	14,688.3	1,422,078	+139.4	+116.1
Total civilian activities	\$7,189.4		\$15,422.1			
Agriculture to total percentage	14.7		4.7			

¹ Appropriations and employment for judiciary included in 1940. Carried under "Other offices and agencies" in 1953 column.

² Excludes Atomic Energy Commission and stockpiling.

³ Includes remainder of Federal establishment, excluding Defense Department, military assistance under Mutual Security, interest on public debt, permanent and indefinite appropriations, working funds, and other special funds.

Mr. Chairman, for the 4 years I served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations and served on such committee, we brought about a complete reorganization in the Department on its means of using property, saving in excess of a million and a half dollars a year; caused the Department to use cold-storage facilities belonging to the military instead of building their own; asked that an investigation be made of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and all subsequent investigations by the Senate, by the Comptroller General, and others were based upon the reports which we gave them. Our recommendations were followed to correct bad practices. In this connection we pointed out to the Committee on the Judiciary in their investigation of the Department of Justice that a big part of the problem in Government was that various departments had an arrangement with the Department of Justice to do their own law enforcement. This, I am glad to say, was corrected.

Mr. Chairman, you can vote for the bill before you and be for economy too, for it is real economy to save our own country, its timber, its lands, harness its streams, protect its ability to provide food and clothing for us and generations to come.

WHY HAVE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS?

In this bill before us today we deal with a great number of things. I know you hear people say, "Why should the Federal Government do this, that, or the other?" There is only one reason we should, because it is to our national and individual interest to do it. We are all depending upon the ability of this Nation to feed and clothe us. Every one of us believes in individual freedom. I do not know of any group that is more individual in its thinking than the American farmer, but we learned earlier that there are many things we can do together better than we can do by each one going his individual way, such as schools and roads.

Why do we have an army? Does anybody like to be inducted and regimented? It is for the national interest for us to bind together, to meet the needs of national defense.

SOIL CONSERVATION IS FARMER'S PRIMARY OBLIGATION

I know it is primarily the problem of the American farmer to look after his land. It is his property. It is to his interest to do it; but for 150 years we let the farmer alone look after the land. We said, "You solely, out of your own share of the national-income dollar, shall be responsible for the maintenance of the soil." For 150 years we let him sell on practically an unprotected market at the market place. In that period we built up protective tariffs. In that period we built up minimum wage laws, but the farmer continued dependent upon what he could get on the open market at the market place. It was understood in that period of time that the average farmer was not expected to furnish his house like other people, or even have the normal or ordinary facilities enjoyed by the rest of the population. It was understood he was to work much longer hours, save his suit for Sunday wear, not because he was not as good an American as the rest but because, under the laws as they were written, his share of the national-income dollar was too small to meet other needs.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I am wondering whether it is not a fact that the American farmer had a protective tariff on his farm and on his wheat during all that time, but he was producing such a surplus that the tariff was not worth anything to him, and he sold on the open market the same as if he had no protection. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is my understanding; that the only tariffs that you had did not protect; and insofar as the

farmers' security is concerned it did not exist. I think, as I have said, it is the primary duty of the farmer to meet his needs, but in that period of time it was understood that the farm boy or girl was expected to work his way through college, and I do not know that that hurt them, but that was not generally true with regard to other segments of your population. In saying that I am not making any appeal to you that the Government should look after the farmer other than on an equal and fair basis, but there has been competition in this Congress over how the laws have been written, and for that period of time there was that difference, and one of the reasons for that difference was that we had unlimited, almost unlimited, acres of fertile soil, and billions of feet of timber, and they could afford to do it because as you wore out one farm you moved on to the next hillside. That situation no longer exists. We do not have the land. In that period the farmer, some farmers, wasted 40 percent of all our fertile soil; he was in an emergency, or thought he was, continuously, where he thought he never could afford to put back into the soil a fair share of what he took out of the soil. Of course some farmers did, but the ones who wore out this land did not.

1975—WHAT THEN?

According to the testimony before our committee by Doctor Shaw, borne out by others and from the best informational sources I know of, by 1975 it is estimated that the population of this country will be in excess of 190 million people. By that time we will need the production of 115 million more acres of land than we now have unless by science and research we are able to increase the yield per acre. We all are interested in it. We must band together here and provide for the future and take protective steps in the national interest. What is so wrong with all of us, through the instrument of the Government, contributing a little bit to protect ourselves and future generations in our ability to eat? What is so wrong with it? Oh, you say it is the farmer's primary job. It is, but he has not done it.

MR. BENSON'S RECOMMENDATIONS

The present administration made certain recommendations which we did not follow. I have come to think lots of the present Secretary. He is a most estimable gentleman. I think he has been finding out a good bit about life in a short period, as much as most anybody; but I want to say this, in some respects, he needed to. One of the first official press releases of the Department after he took over was this:

The United States Department of Agriculture, largest of all the Nation's civilian agencies, swollen into a huge bureaucracy of 20 agencies and bureaus in the last 20 years, is getting a major overhauling.

Again that is not true. This Department, I repeat, is operating with 38 percent less people than in 1940. All other civilian activities average an increase of 126 percent.

Secretary Benson did not issue that statement. He testified to our committee that after he learned of the statement that he was unhappy about it and retracted it. But that statement does represent the atmosphere that permeated the Department during the time Mr. Benson's budget was being prepared. The head of every agency and every department was called in; and while nobody testified to it in so many words, it is quite apparent that they understood, this statement having been in the paper and not having been corrected at the time when they appeared before the Secretary's committee, that they had to cut down even though what they cut out was highly important. Now, there is one of the reasons we have not followed the Secretary in many of his recommendations.

Recently we had Secretary Benson before the committee about the reorganization plan a long time after his recommendations on the budget were made. Last week, I believe, he was before a Senate committee. He told us he had not had time to know what he wants to do in the Department. From the press, he told the Senate committee he had not had time to make up his mind. Now, if he has not had time now to know how to reorganize or run his Department what could he have known 2 or 3 weeks after he took over the Department what these appropriations should be?

There are many other things that justify this committee in writing the kind of bill that this committee jointly has written for the last 4 years and prior to that time through joint efforts of our side with the help of our Republican colleagues.

COMMITTEES' OBLIGATION

Our primary obligation is to the people and to the Nation and we have tried to discharge that obligation. We feel we have for we have had the Department investigated every year for 4 years and we have tried to correct everything we have seen that was not correct. We therefore believe we are in a little bit better position to recommend funds for this Department to this Congress than any individual who might come in following a round of campaign oratory in an atmosphere which produced such an incorrect statement as that which was released to the press, which, I think, was the first official press release of the new administration. At least it was issued before the chairs had gotten warm.

What have we done to this bill about major items? I know from my own correspondence what most of your interest will be.

RESEARCH

Four years ago we had three divisions of research in the Department of Agriculture—the Secretary's fund, the regular research fund and research under the Research and Marketing Act. It was hard for us to distinguish one project from another. We also learned that if the Congress cut down the appropriation for almost any agency they would go over to the Research and Marketing Division, get an allocation of funds and to a large extent keep the same folks working at the same stand. We tried to correct that by putting all of this research

fund in the same pot, so to speak, and having an advisory committee in industry throughout the country meet with the research people twice a year to go over with them the projects that they thought needed attention and the work that was to be done.

In the period of the last 4 years we think we have gotten to the point where it is working and we can move ahead. Practically every item of research in the Department now is subjected to the scrutiny and the competition of folks in the trade who want somebody to give attention to this, that, or the other problem. Having reached that point and having reached the period when we are putting millions of dollars into various commodities, at a time when we are losing the cotton markets and other markets for agricultural products through competition and other reasons, it is highly important from a monetary standpoint that we increase our efforts to meet those problems. We have made substantial increases in the research fund in this bill.

CONSERVATION PROGRAM

The next item that so many people have talked to me about is the soil and conservation program. I think the gentlemen on my left have pretty much covered the action of the committee with regard to the Soil Conservation Service. There is one item on which I certainly differ with the Benson approach. That is the one providing that all of the nurseries be closed that were under the operation of the Soil Conservation Service.

Some years ago we spent millions of dollars selling the American people on the need for reforestation. But, then, we discovered we had no trees for them to set out. Our committee corrected that. When we created the Soil Conservation Service we had no grass seed, we had no young trees, we had no material things for them to use. That is the way your nurseries came into being. It is said that in many instances the States can take them over. I do not know. But this committee would not go along with the Secretary's recommendation to abolish them and we have recommended about half the amount they have this year "to carry such nurseries until some satisfactory solution can be worked out."

We refused to follow Mr. Benson's recommendations to end abruptly quarantine and other work on sweetpotato weevil, phony peach disease, and Japanese beetle. Here we provided about half the amount they had this year on the same basis as with the Soil Conservation Service nurseries.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION

In that connection, in this bill we have taken another action which I think is one of the most forward steps that a Congress could take. For this action I must claim a fair share of the credit for myself and my party. I refer to this watershed flood prevention program. I went out to the Democratic Convention in Chicago last year and urged the Democratic Party to include as a part of its farm plank an assurance of special and additional attention to watershed flood prevention. I succeeded and that was incorporated in the Democratic farm

plank. Not because it was there, but because they, too, recognized the need, I am glad to say that our friends on the subcommittee on the Republican side with our support have added in this bill what I believe is a start in the right direction. We have provided \$5 million for about 50 small watershed pilot plants, 1 in most of the watersheds of this Nation. These will be constructed on a cooperative basis with local interests to see if we cannot help meet this flood problem to a large extent by stopping the water before it reaches the size of floods.

SOIL EROSION AND FLOOD DAMAGE

As I told this Congress many times, one of the hardest tasks I ever had to perform was to sit on a committee and deal with the Kansas-Nebraska flood and see the untold damage that was done; with \$2 billion worth of property damage and from \$60 to \$80 million of expense to the Federal Government. Is it not cheaper in advance to try to do something about it? According to the measurements made at the city of Memphis, Tenn., every day in the year on the average there flows down the Mississippi River the topsoil of fifty 40-acre farms. At least that soil used to spread over the Mississippi and the Louisiana deltas where it did some good, but now those fifty 40-acre farms flow on out to sea each day. Is it common sense to let that condition continue so that we will eventually get into the position of India, Greece, Palestine, or China, or many other countries which we are aiding today? You may say it cannot happen here. I repeat we have already wasted 40 percent of our natural land resources. Shall we sit idly by saying, "Let us practice rugged individualism." If the farmers, or 40 percent of them, cannot or will not take care of the land, why should we worry? Shall we continue to allow our country to continue to go down the road to a need for a Marshall plan? Those wornout countries are the beneficiaries today of your dollars and mine. If we wear out our country, who would help us? Who could help us? If any there are it would be the country which has taken care of its natural resources. You may argue with me as to how best to meet this problem, but I do not think there can be any argument about the need to meet it. We are trying to do it in this bill under the agencies as they are now constituted. Somebody says we should abolish all the Federal programs. I say we had better not. You might improve on its operations, but with the Extension Service and the Soil Conservation Service, the PMA, and the individual efforts of everybody concerned in this field, you have not been doing too good a job. They say we owe more than \$265 billion; we are in an emergency; let us cut down on the attention to our farm plant. Do you know why most of this land was worn out? Because the farmer himself always thought he was in an emergency. He never could see how he could afford to put back a fair share of what he took out. In our committee hearings, I thought it ironical that a Mississippi lawyer like me had to argue with the heads of farm organizations

who said, "We are in an emergency; therefore, we feel that we should give less attention to preserving our country." It is bad enough to overdraw at the Treasury, it is bad to have an unbalanced budget and certainly I do not wish that condition to continue, and we have to correct it, but is it not much worse to overdraw on your natural resources, your real wealth, of your own country? You could wipe out every dollar, as bad as that would be, but you could set up another financial system. However, destroy your soil and there is nothing on which to build.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman has brought out with great clarity this new proposed program for pilot plant demonstrations on various watersheds throughout the country. Now the gentleman knows, as I do, that had it not been for the fact that we have seen fit to override the revised budget to the extent of this \$5 million, the direct appropriation in this bill would have been \$1,057,914,000 below that requested by Mr. Benson, the present Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have not checked the figures, and I know the gentleman is usually correct, and I trust he figured this correctly. I have not had the opportunity to check that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I appreciate that.

Mr. WHITTEN. One point where the committee has substantially differed with Secretary Benson is in the flood prevention work, to some extent on research and on the loan authorization for the Farmers Home Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, as well as abolishing quarantine work, ending Soil Conservation Service nurseries and letting out the home agents of the Farmers' Home Administration.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS—FHA, REA

Mr. WHITTEN. Loan authorizations are not necessarily appropriations and certainly do not represent annual operating costs. I may say the Department is going to run the FHA and REA. Those programs are going to be under the Secretary and his Department. Why should he ask us to put a ceiling down below what the need might be? Below what we believe it will be? The REA Act itself says you cannot borrow money to build lines except where the people do not get central station current. It says you cannot make such a loan unless the applicant proves it is a sound loan and can and will be repaid. Why should he object to a raised ceiling?

If the need should be proven, even to him, should he not want a ceiling high enough to meet the need? But the Secretary, 40 days in office, says the need is not there. If it is not, doubtless he will not make the loans. What harm is the higher authorization to him? He has charge of passing on the applications. As to the Farmers Home Administration, I think there is going to be a real need for the authorization in this bill,

because the testimony showed that within a few months after last year's appropriations were made all the funds were committed. I think there is a real need, but there, too, the law says that with regard to tenant purchases the applicant has to meet the requirements of the law, the loan must be sound and it has to provide for repayment.

PRODUCTION AND SUBSISTENCE LOANS

With regard to the subsistence loans, the applicant has to show he cannot get credit any other place. Whether it is right or wrong, we do have relief in this country. We have so many ways that one way or another these people are going to be taken care of. I think it is a much sounder, a much more sensible, and a much cheaper way to lend a man money which he will repay and let him reestablish himself. The record is wonderful. You would hardly believe you could operate a program such as this on as sound a basis as you do, when you limit yourself in the first instance to applicants who cannot get the money anywhere else.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not admit that the Farmers Home Administration is essentially a relief program?

Mr. WHITTEN. No. I say in the absence of these programs people would be on relief one way or another. I say it is a case of our joining together in this system of private enterprise to make self-supporting a group which was not before. We have to recognize that if we do not do something along this line and give them an opportunity to repay these loans with interest and establish themselves, we are missing the boat, and are probably leading ourselves into some of the difficulties foreign countries have.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. How can the gentleman brand it as a sound program when in the lending of \$160,000,000 a year it costs \$27,000,000 just to administer the program?

Mr. WHITTEN. If you were putting it on the basis of what it should cost to operate a program the situation would be different. Take the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The relative administrative cost is very, very small. In the Farm Credit Administration the cost of handling a given volume is very, very small. In the Farmers Home Administration it is not a case of just handling the loan, it is a case of supervising the man and helping him to rehabilitate or reestablish himself. It is the kind of program where you do not just count the number of loans and balance the books. A major part of the program is supervision, and that is as it should be. In that connection, I should like to say we have directed that they keep the women home supervisors in those areas where they are needed because, in my judgment, they do as fine a job and are as much responsible for the success of this program as any other group. The committee felt that way, and has directed that this agency keep those fine people in that job.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In regard to the remarks that have been made here this afternoon about the Farmers Home Administration, that is, as to whether or not it is a sensible or a sound or a proper program, I think the appropriate place for that to be taken up would be on some measure other than an appropriation bill, because the Appropriations Committee is simply carrying out an order which has previously been given it by the Congress. In truth and in fact, it is incumbent upon the Appropriations Committee to bring in an adequate amount of money to implement and put that program into effect. Certainly the Appropriations Committee should not be criticized for doing what the Congress has heretofore directed it to do.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my colleague. He certainly is correct. While appropriations are not compulsory, the committee should do as my colleague suggests. There is a whole lot of legislation to which some are opposed. If certain individuals do not like it, the place to correct it is in the legislative committee. It so happens that I believe in this program, as I know my colleague from Mississippi does, but the place to raise the question is in the legislative committee which would have to do with changing the law if it were desired to do so.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is one of the true champions of American agriculture. He has always done a splendid job on this floor with respect to appropriations for the farmer.

I am not entirely satisfied with the explanation that has been given with respect to the \$5 million cut for the Soil Conservation Service.

I understand from the gentleman's remarks that he certainly is in favor of the watershed conservation program, but does he think that such effort will suffice or be sufficient to justify the substantial cut of \$5 million or more for soil conservation work?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will tell the gentleman frankly that there are a good many items here which do not reflect my individual opinion, but I think the figures here are so much better than they might have been in the overall, I feel I should sustain the committee. When I say that, I am sure every individual member of this committee could make the same statement for himself, except that we would differ as to where the items were. But the reduction here in the Soil Conservation Service is not from the present year. The reductions, which you mentioned, had to do with the Truman budget. My colleagues were correct in their statements when they say they did not organize anything like the number of new districts for which we made provision last year. The answer of those in the soil conservation district associations is that since the people knew the

money was not available, and new districts could be serviced only by making the service of other districts a little more thin where it is already too thin—that is the reason your districts were not organized. Nevertheless they were not, and the only reduction as against the present year was about a 50 percent reduction in this nursery tree item. The committee did not go along with a proposed increase, which was in the Truman budget, neither did it reduce it from the present year except for a reduction of 50 percent in the nursery item.

Mr. EVINS. Knowing the gentleman's views, and he being the champion of agriculture, as I know he is, I feel that the gentleman believes as I do that it certainly is false economy to continue to cut down on soil-conservation work when it is so very vital.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. WHITTEN. That is my feeling. In this bill we announce a \$195 million ceiling for the ACP, for the coming year, a reduction of \$55,000,000. I would like to answer here misleading statements which always bob up in this debate. Heretofore practices under the soil-conservation program were built up from the community level to the top. The community farmers met and selected the community committee. They selected or elected the county committee. The community recommended to the county and the county to the State and the State to the National Government as to what practices were thought to be best and most needed in a particular area. The Department down here went over all that and selected those practices and put them in a catalog. Sixty-eight percent of those practices in that catalog are permanent-type practices. Then that catalog was sent back and selections were made by the State, county, and community. Then, I want to point out first that the Federal Government contributed approximately 50 percent of the monetary cost and the farmer put up on the average an equal amount of money and an equal amount of labor to start that. This is something that all Members might think about. Any community that used up this money on sorry or trifling practices, selected such practices themselves and ignored 68 percent of this catalog in so doing. Any individual who got a check for his contribution on the part of the Federal Government either asked for it himself or had somebody do it for him. Anybody who got such a contribution not only asked for it, but claimed that he had done something for it. And if he had just let it alone, perhaps it would have been made available to somebody who could have made better use of it.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. In addition to what the gentleman has said, in my State and I presume it has been done in other States in the United States, these practices that are carried out for soil-conservation purposes are checked with the experiment stations to meet the requirements in the individual States.

Mr. WHITTEN. And all States could well follow your example.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. To put it another way, the fact is that that farmer who received that check for certain practices either had to show by some direct proof that he had actually performed the practices or else he received the money through some fraudulent representation that he had performed it.

Mr. WHITTEN. He did. Many times, perhaps some agent or some manager or someone else may have done it in his name. I know cases where perhaps that happened, and I do agree that some folks have selected such trifling practices. But I want the finger to be put where it should be put, and that is right in the county or in the community which was a party to it, or else the individual would not have collected.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Is it not possible that putting this in the management of local committees just makes it easy for them to devise practices to take Government money?

Mr. WHITTEN. It depends on the type of people. Some people fall for that kind of thing quicker than others. I have seen some otherwise good people fall for it. But it is a waste of Government money. It is not right, and they should be ashamed of themselves for doing it.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. How far are you apart with Secretary Benson on this ACP payment?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Benson recommended \$140 million. Here is the way this is handled: We announce the limit that the Federal Government will contribute for the following year. This is a ceiling. None of it will be paid unless somebody earns it. The present administration says it is going to tighten down on the practices. They are going to send out a list of what they can do and what they cannot do to get contributions, but if no farmer performs, we do not pay any of it. It is a ceiling. Now, if there be a need, why should he want us to have a low ceiling? You know farming is hard. We should make a special effort to get them to do more, now with so many men in the service and it being so difficult to get help. We announced a \$250 million program last year, and the farmers earned only \$211 million. This is nothing but a ceiling that we are establishing. If Mr. Benson is going to do, as he testified he was going to, limit this practice to permanent-type practices, he is running the Department, and if they are going to do that and if the farmer cannot get any Federal contribution except for permanent-type practices, if the farmer is going to swear that he did do it, and do something extra for it, and if we have wasted all this land needed to do something, why have such a low limit? Why hold it down there, unless, as some folks think, they are trying to kill the program gradually? I am not talking about the Secretary, but I know some of his ad-

visers who have been against this program for years.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. You also mentioned or insinuated your approval of the permanent-type practices as against the purely temporary practice.

Mr. WHITTEN. I certainly do.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. If it is logical for us to confine this to permanent-type practices, not simply contribute dollars to the farmer's annual expenses, then the cut that he suggests is quite logical, because, according to the figures that I have, something like \$50 million was spent purely for chemicals on annual-type practices, not permanent-type practices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Last year we urged the committee in the county to try to get lands in this program that needed it most. It was unfortunate that it happened to come in a political year, because many folks gave political implications to it. Certainly there was no such intent on my part or on the part of the committee, but by having called on the landowner who had land that needed this kind of work most, the increase in those who said they would go into the program was about 80 percent. In many sections of the country, after they had announced the maximum that the Federal Government would contribute, they had to come back and say, "We cannot go but half that far, because so many folks have signed up that we cannot go that far." In every announcement they made they said, "Within the funds available." So when they got to the point where the funds were not sufficient, they had a right to go back and scale it down.

I have urged time and again in the committee that we give more attention to permanent-type practices, by every means short of telling them from Washington what they had to do.

I had some fun in these hearings by pointing out to the Assistant Secretary the position he had gotten himself into. They ran on the basis that they were going to stop dictation from Washington. The first thing he had to do here was to tell the communities what practices they had to follow. There is, of course, inconsistency, but I am glad I am not in that one.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. When the Committee on Agriculture looked into this problem, they authorized that annual expenditures be made up to \$500 million. The Appropriations Committee of the House has never anywhere near approached that. I would like at this time to call attention to the innumerable witnesses who appeared before our committee—and their testimony is scattered all through the hearings. It will show the need for carrying on soil-conservation work, and I think it would be well for Members of the House in the spare time that few of us have to review in the hearings what these programs have brought

out actually. Actually we have a pretty dismal picture in connection with the wasting of the national resources of this country. I think it is well for all of us to read and think about the inscription that appears on the wall of this Chamber above the Speaker's dais:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for this statement. That challenge could well be repeated every day in the year.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi for one of the finest explanations it has been my privilege to listen to on any bill; I think he has done a great piece of work giving us the reasoning behind this bill and the reasoning behind the compromises the committee has necessarily worked out, and I realize that we have to have compromises to get legislation. But before the gentleman yields the floor, I wonder if he would discuss with us a little the loan authorizations for the rural electrification programs? Of course, I read the bill and find that you provide \$135 million for electrical services and \$50 million for telephone services, and then I note that you provide \$30 million, but I am frank to say that I do not fully understand it, and I wonder if the gentleman would explain to us just how that \$30 million can be spent, under what circumstances, whether it can be spent without restriction as to the present limitation that is in the basic law or whether it is simply an extension of the appropriation, and whether it is something that can be spent, or whether it is something that is going to be frozen and that we are not going to have more rural electrification?

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. WHITTEN. Insofar as the committee's intentions—and I started that practice 4 years ago the first year I was chairman of this subcommittee—the law says that these loans can be made only under certain conditions: One is, as I stated earlier and as the gentleman himself knows, having worked with the program in his own committee and elsewhere—they must show that they do not get central station current, that it is economically feasible, and that the loan will be repaid.

We feel that if those conditions are met, since the loans will be paid back with interest and on which we have not as much as two-tenths of one percent of loans 30 days in arrears, we feel that if those conditions arise the loans should be made because they would be sound loans and a good investment in the United States of America.

We wanted to be sure that if applications reached that level they would be met. If that \$130 million is used up, it is the intention of this committee that if in any State their pro rata share of the \$130 million is used up, that so much

of the \$30 million as may be necessary to meet the bona fide sound applications shall be made available.

In addition to that \$30 million there is a carry-over of \$35 million which is not tied down by the same formula as is this. There again I cannot see why the Department should raise a whole lot of sand about what the ceiling is. They are going to pass on whether there will be any loans at all or not, and they are doing some things that make you think they are going to be rather hard on some of these matters—I do not know—I hope not; but I want them to know that the ceiling is high enough where they cannot lay it in the lap of Congress if they do not meet the needs of the American people for this sound program.

Mr. POAGE. That means there is \$190 million that will be available for loans for the rural electrification program next year.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. If there are applications that meet all of the qualifications.

RURAL TELEPHONE

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. Let me say this about the telephone program before I forget it: The committee agreed on \$65 million for the telephone program for the remainder of this year and all next year; but \$15 million is now pending in a supplemental appropriation bill in conference between the House and the Senate. It was agreed by the subcommittee that unless that is forthcoming the committee will offer an amendment increasing this to \$65 million where it is now \$50 million.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I agree fully with the gentleman that we intend to make the full \$65 million available if possible. If the supplemental fails to carry we will then urge the other body to put in the \$65 million; then we will uphold that in conference. It is our intention to see to it that \$65 million total is made available for that particular program.

Mr. POAGE. If we may get it perfectly clear, let me ask this: If this bill passes, we can expect \$190 million of money to be available for use for electrical purposes, \$65 million of which to be handled, as the chairman of the subcommittee has explained, for rural telephone services. There is no supplemental fund and no carryover, as I understand it, for rural telephones. I understand about the carryover for rural electrification, but there is none for rural telephones, as I understand it? Is that right?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. So that the \$65 million will be the absolute limit for rural telephones. Right now there are applications for \$99 million pending for rural telephones and about \$216 million for electrical extensions?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is my understanding. Let me explain for those who hear these figures bandied around and get the authorization mixed up with the appropriation. This is the authoriza-

tion. This is how far they could go if all the requirements of law were met by the applicants and they approved the applications, but not a dollar is spent nor appropriated nor taken out of the Treasury and no interest paid until after the loan is approved, and not then until the money is spent on the construction of the line. Let us not get that mixed up as being a part of the annual cost of the Department of Agriculture as some folks seem to wish to do.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. This program has already cost the Government quite a lot of money, a great deal of money has been appropriated throughout the years. Can the gentleman from Mississippi tell me how much we have put into this proposition?

Mr. WHITTEN. The total amount of money that has been put into the rural electrification programs through the years and the total amount of loans that have been made I do not have at hand.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I am interested in that because I come from a kind of a rural part of the country—New England. It is mostly rural. Ninety-eight percent of the farmers in Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Massachusetts have electricity, and we have never asked the Government for a nickel in any one of those three States. The families get along pretty good up there. Apparently this money has been spent in other States than those of New England.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is spent in other States than New England, and part of the interest that the folks pay back, I hope, is helping New England and the rest of us to support the Government, because they do repay it with interest. But in New England you have some problems we do not have. You also have some things that make it so easy for you to meet many of your needs that we do not find exists in other sections. For instance, the matter of distance. With all due deference to New England, you like to pride yourselves on keeping the feel of the ground, and agriculture is expressed endearingly, but the size of New England is such that you do not have the same type of problem in extending electrical lines that we have in the State of Texas, which I recall is about the size of New England. We have tried to meet this in those areas where the law says they must show that otherwise they cannot get central station current.

They have to show ability to repay it and they must repay it with interest. The records over there show that less than two-tenths of 1 percent have been as much as 30 days behind in their repayment. Now, only about 15 percent of the American people are feeding all the rest of us, with all the boys in the service. The REA has saved the day, and it is a sound, money-making program, and I think the gentleman, knowing his record here, is 100 percent for it. I do not want to expand unless there is a real need.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Of course, I am also interested in all this money we get back on projects that are self-supporting, and everything, but it seems to me that every year when appropriation bills come up there is at least as much appropriated this year as there was the year before. I cannot understand how we are saving money by spending, as the gentleman from Texas pointed out, or being in a position to spend, \$190 million this year.

Mr. WHITTEN. Many of your private power companies never thought that the farmers would buy electricity for use on even a small scale in some sections, but it is interesting to note that the number of farmers on REA lines is almost twice as many as was contemplated, and the consumption of electricity by the farmers now that they have electrical appliances and labor-saving devices and live like the rest of the folks do, their demand for electricity is about twice what anybody thought it would be. As a result, many of these lines are in need of rephasing, that is, they must be increased in size to take care of the larger load.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from Mississippi was asked about the total amount of funds made available to the Rural Electrification Administration. I think the total is \$2¾ billion. As to the program that we have authorized here, I just want to make it clear for the record that it is \$135 million in electrification loans plus a contingent fund of \$30 million in electrification loans plus \$25 million free fund, which is a carryover which was not estimated in the Truman budget which was sent up to the committee originally. That \$25 million can be used. It does not have to be used in accordance with the regular formula which provides that no more than 10 percent of the total loan authorization can go to any one State. In addition to that, there is the \$65 million program of the Rural Telephone Administration, which is in addition to the total \$190 million possible program in electrification.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. I want to repeat again that this is a ceiling; this is an authorization, and I am sure that my friends on the left would not think for a minute that the administration would abuse its discretion in too free handily approving these applications. This is the maximum. Of course, whether they approve any or not is up to them.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I think it might well be pointed out that not only has REA been a profit-making program but that many of the payments of loans have been made far in advance of the scheduled time for repayment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly. They talk about this, that, and the other, but throughout history we have learned many things we can do better by joining them together, and this is one of them. Up until we joined through the instru-

ment of the Government, we know that the American farmer was in a bad way.

In this bill we direct the Department to measure acreage planted to cotton and wheat in an effort to keep at a minimum the problem of controls. We provide additional funds for studying the method of crop estimating. We maintain this year's figure on the school lunch program, provide for the Forestry Department, for extension to the limit of the authorization. We have tried to meet the many problems facing us.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have consumed as much time as I should. I hope to meet other questions that arise as we go into the reading of the bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to speak briefly on the subject of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1954.

This session marks my first year of service on the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations. It has been a most interesting and informative experience. It has also been a pleasure to work with the other members of the subcommittee. I have great respect for their ability, industry, and devotion to the interests and well-being of American agriculture. I have learned much from my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. Although we have differed in our ideas with respect to some of the items in the bill under consideration, we nevertheless find ourselves in general agreement with respect to the bill as a whole. Concerning the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], I can say most advisedly that the Seventh District of Minnesota has in him a shrewd and forceful Representative, and the American farmer a considerate and loyal friend. While staunchly defending and looking out for the welfare of his own constituents, his general outlook and attitude have been in no sense provincial. He is acutely aware of the problems and importance of American agriculture in its entirety.

The Department of Agriculture is a tremendous and fascinating agency. The hearings of the subcommittee were a revelation to me. I had never realized how vast were the Department's responsibilities or how complex its problems. It is fortunate, indeed, that we have in charge of its activities a man of the capabilities of Ezra Taft Benson. Mr. Benson brings to the Department a rare combination of intelligence, integrity, training and experience which will serve it well. He has surrounded himself with able assistants—Mr. True Morse, Mr. John Davis, Mr. Earl Coke, Mr. Romeo Short, Mr. Howard Gordon, Mr. Daiken Broadhead, just to name a few. All of these men are serving in Washington at a financial sacrifice. They have given up secure positions in a spirit of dedication to Federal public service. They all know American agriculture. They all have in common a desire to serve their country in that field.

The bill in its broad outlines has been well covered by the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. Like him, and like the other members of the committee, I think it is a good bill. It will serve our country well—not just those who are engaged in agricultural pursuits, but all of America.

As pointed out, the amount recommended for regular activities is less than the funds available for the current fiscal year. Actually, a substantial increase over this year's appropriations would be justified. However, in the interest of the overriding necessity of seeking by every means possible to bring the overall Federal budget into balance, a cut in expenditures is mandatory.

As far as my own opinion is concerned, there are within the total amount recommended some items which should be increased and others decreased. However, any appropriation bill will contain compromises. Complete accord on every item even among members of the seven-man subcommittee is a practical impossibility, let alone such accord among all Members of Congress.

Nevertheless, I am constrained to point out a few instances where my thinking differs from that as reflected in the bill as reported out.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

An advance authorization for the 1954 crop year of \$195 million is recommended for the agricultural-conservation program, which has as its purposes restoring and improving soil fertility, reducing erosion caused by wind and water, and conserving water on land. This compares with an authorization of \$250 million for the 1953 crop year and \$140 million recommended by the Department of Agriculture in its revised budget. I personally favor the Department's request of \$140 million. That amount is also recommended by the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau Federation. The reduction would be affected by confining program assistance to the more lasting or permanent type conservation practices; for example:

First. Enduring—permanent type—mechanical and vegetative practices whose benefits will continue through a period of several years when they are (a) properly applied where needed to attain the conservation objective and (b) adequately maintained.

Second. Practices needed for conservation purposes but which would not likely be initiated in an area by farmers without financial assistance.

Third. Practices which, although essential to the public welfare, will not return sufficient short-term economic benefits to the farmer to provide the necessary encouragement for him to install them.

There is a reasonable association between the more lasting conservation practices and those for which farmers generally need assistance most. The more permanent type practices often require rather heavy outlays, and the benefits from them are realized over many years rather than in a short time. The more often repeated practices by their very nature are likely to be ones

which pay off through increased production within a fairly short time.

Although the committee has recommended an advance authorization for the 1954 crop year in excess of the Department's request, it is important to note that the committee report accompanying the bill contains the statement that increased attention should be given to those practices which have more than annual benefits to the soil. In that statement, I wholeheartedly concur.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Seventy-five million eight hundred sixty-nine thousand one hundred forty-five dollars has been recommended for the constituent agencies of the Agricultural Research Administration. This is \$262,423 more than the 1953 appropriations but \$1,288,663 less than that recommended by the Department in its revised estimates. Many persons and organizations, including the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange, have recommended an increase over the current year's appropriations of \$17 million. There is no question but what such an additional amount could be well and profitably spent. Research is definitely the kind of activity which the Government can do far better than the farmer can do for himself. And, the benefits which result are shared by all—not just the farmer. Eradication of animal diseases, mechanization of farm production, increased utilization of milk nonfat solids, improvement of quality of products and savings in handling and transportation of foods mean a better life for all of us.

Of the small additional amount recommended, it is important to note that, first, \$69,445 is earmarked for use by the Bureau of Dairy Industry to increase research designed to help the dairy industry meet surplus butter problems; second, \$115,000 for research on cotton; and third, \$10,000 for studies on food preservation. Evidence presented to the committee demonstrates clearly that lack of research on cotton has contributed to the loss of large markets to synthetic fibers. In view of existing cotton surpluses and impending acreage controls, all possible action should be taken to enable this commodity to maintain its competitive position in the markets. The increase of \$10,000 for research on food preservation will enable the Bureau to speed up its work on dehydrating fruits and vegetables. The ultimate savings to the consumer in handling, transportation and refrigeration of foods makes this a very promising line of research. Remarkable progress has been made in the development of an orange-juice powder, which, with water added and chilled, makes an exceedingly appetizing drink.

It is unfortunate that these increases are so meager. As I previously stated, an additional \$17 million could well be utilized. Let us hope then that the Agricultural Research Administration makes the most of what it has. In this regard, it would be well to observe the recommendation of the committee in its report that the research programs of the Department be reexamined to make certain that they are directed primarily to

problems of farmers on the land. Furthermore, it is felt by many informed observers that considerable duplication throughout the constituent agencies could be eliminated and the savings thereby realized used in solving some of the pressing problems which are suffering from lack of funds.

FOREST SERVICE—RECREATIONAL AREAS

Another matter which I would like to call to the attention of the House is that of sanitation and care of recreational areas in the national forests.

The committee has recommended an increase of \$250,000 to improve serious sanitary conditions in the recreational areas and campgrounds of the national forests. The current fiscal year appropriation is \$690,000. A total of \$940,000, therefore, is recommended for 1954. An additional amount of \$570,000 out of funds for protection and management of the national forests is available this year for improvement maintenance. No increase in this item has been recommended for 1954. These proposed appropriations are entirely inadequate.

During the calendar year 1951, public use of the national forests, exclusive of highway travel, amounted to 30 million visits, totaling 44 million man-days' use. This is an increase of 9 percent over the 27 million visits reported for 1950.

Overcrowding at many large public-use areas and the fact that practically no new areas have been developed since World War II, plus the deteriorated condition of many areas, are making the care, policing, and maintenance of the existing facilities more difficult and costly. Sanitation is a serious problem throughout the national forests and is aggravated by overcrowding. Inspections made by the United States Public Health Service and State and local sanitary officers show that many national-forest, public-use areas, especially the larger areas, are not satisfactory and should have better toilets, water systems, and garbage disposal.

Continuing efforts are being made to obtain greater participation by local communities in the management of local public-use areas, and in increasing the number of concessioner-operated installations, in order to reduce the burden of maintenance on the Federal Government. Although these efforts continue, progress is limited in relation to the total job involved. It appears quite certain that this approach will not answer the real problem of urgently needed improved sanitation and care of public campgrounds.

Existing facilities are completely inadequate. They are geared to take care of about half of the 33 million annual visits now being made. I asked the Forest Service what it would take to do the job right. This is the answer I received, and it sounds reasonable to me.

One million and seventy-one thousand dollars is needed annually for sanitation, cleanup, garbage disposal, fire prevention and supervision at existing recreation areas. One million one hundred and ninety-seven thousand dollars is needed annually for maintenance of improvements and facilities at existing recreation areas. These figures total \$2,-

268,000, which are to be compared with the 1954 proposed figures of \$940,000 and \$570,000, totaling \$1,510,000.

Additional capital investments needed for recreation area improvements and facilities are not even considered in the 1954 budget. Seven million one hundred and sixty-nine thousand dollars are needed to provide satisfactory facilities for sanitation, fire prevention, and public safety and to put all essential existing public-use areas and facilities in safe and sanitary condition. Seventeen million one hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars are needed to expand the capacity of existing areas and to construct new areas necessary to accommodate present use in a safe and satisfactory manner. This program is proposed for 5 years; however, it could be extended to 8 or 10 years, thus decreasing the funds needed for capital investment each year.

It is estimated that when the program is completed, the total annual cost of the whole recreation job will be \$3,200,000. The exact amount, of course, will depend upon the volume of public use and the purchasing power of the dollar at the time.

The forest recreation problem is one which merits the attention of Congress. It is not being satisfactorily met at the present time. The situation is serious.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

One of the most important changes to take place in the Department of Agriculture since Secretary Benson has taken office has been the creation of the Foreign Agricultural Service, which is charged with performing the duties formerly undertaken by the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. It is most earnestly hoped that this will be a real change and not a mere juggling of squares on an organization chart.

It has long been felt that the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations could be revitalized and reorganized so as to better serve its original and primary purpose, that of providing information regarding supplies and prices of agricultural products in foreign markets and smoothing the economic and diplomatic paths over which export products move. It is particularly important that this be done at this time in view of the increasing difficulties experienced in maintaining foreign markets for American farm products.

The importance of agricultural exports to our American economy cannot be underestimated. In the 1951-52 marketing year, over \$4 billion worth of our agricultural commodities were exported. These exports were 5½ times in value and double in volume those of the 5 prewar years, 1935-39.

American exports have been substantially facilitated by economic aid. With shifts in the nature of economic aid, it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain foreign markets for American farm products. United States cotton, tobacco, grains, fruits, lard, soybeans, dairy and other products have to compete for scarce dollars with the requirements of our foreign customers for industrial and military items. In addition to the problem of competing for available dollar

exchange, there is the problem of restored and increased agricultural production abroad. Thus, American agriculture must compete for sales, as well as dollars.

During the 1952-53 marketing year, the latest estimate on the value of agricultural exports is \$2.9 billion, only a small percentage of which is being paid for by our military and MSA programs. That marks a sharp decline over 1951-52. It accounts in large measure for the mounting agricultural supplies in the United States.

It is no wonder, therefore, that under the reorganization, emphasis will be re-oriented toward developing offshore markets for our agricultural production, including the sending abroad of highly competent agricultural commodity specialists who are thoroughly acquainted with the production and trade problems involving these commodities in the United States and who are capable of analyzing the complex foreign market situations for the guidance of the United States Department of Agriculture and the producers and exporters of these commodities.

To accomplish this purpose, a new branch is being set up, called Foreign Trade Development, and within this branch, a division called Foreign Marketing Services, which will include the foreign commodity marketing specialists. In this connection, it is amazing to note that at the present time the Department has only 3 full-time and 5 part-time such specialists. This is particularly ironic at a time when, faced as we are with agricultural surpluses at home and a falling off of exports, our Government has on the payroll literally hundreds of agricultural experts who are roaming about the globe showing others how to increase their own agricultural production. Granted that there be merit in this foreign assistance program, still there is such a thing as balance.

It is also understood that under the reorganization, the new Foreign Agricultural Service will participate more actively than its predecessor in negotiations in connection with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—to assure more adequate representation and stronger defense of the basic interests of American agriculture under this agreement and the various trade arrangements with the participating countries.

There is ample evidence that agriculture has not been adequately represented in international trade-agreement conferences. In 20 years of so-called reciprocal trade, tariffs on American agricultural products have been cut by more than half. Compare that with the record of the automobile industry. The ad valorem on foreign autos has never changed. It was 10 percent in 1930; it is still 10 percent.

The committee recommends \$673,000 for this activity for 1954, which represents an increase of \$59,876 over 1953. Other funds totaling approximately \$6 million will be available, as heretofore, from other agencies. The committee feels that this office can become an extremely important part of the Department and a highly effective part of our

international program if this proposed change in emphasis is carried out effectively.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. The public use of the national forests is one program in which the people get to exercise their right and interest in our great national forests. This is part of our great recreational program and I want to compliment the gentleman on what he said with regard to it. I wonder if the gentleman would care to tell us some of the things that have taken place in his own area where certain lakes and recreational facilities have had to be closed down because there were not sufficient sanitary facilities which constituted a health menace.

Mr. HUNTER. That is absolutely correct. I thank the gentleman from California for his remarks. I did not wish to make this in any sense provincial, because the national forests extend throughout the length and breadth of our country. The incident the gentleman mentions in California is applicable to the Bass Lake area which is in the Sierra National Forest. The public camp ground operated there by the Forest Service was developed to accommodate 1,500 people at one time, yet the use on weekends and holidays reaches as high as 10,000 per day.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that it was only through the effective urging of the gentleman from California that the subcommittee decided to take the action concerning the problem about which the gentleman from California has just been speaking. The gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], of course, is more conversant with the situation in these recreational areas than are the other members of the subcommittee as he is close to our large national forests. He has aided us considerably in arriving at the decision we have made.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my distinguished chairman. I would like to say that there is no disagreement amongst members of the subcommittee on the problem involved; it is a question of trying to keep the overall budget within reasonable limits. We do hope that in time we can expand and improve this program to meet current need.

But getting back to the Bass Lake area in California, it was only recently that the public-health officer of Madera County closed the area down for sanitary reasons.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I agree with the gentleman that this should not be a provincial matter, because it is one that affects the people of the entire United States. These national forests are scattered all over the United States and provide recreational areas for all of the people who care to use them. But it is only as we speak about these indi-

vidual places we are familiar with that we can actually point up the problem before the Congress.

Mr. HUNTER. I certainly agree with the gentleman. These areas are not used by the people in the immediate vicinity. The national forests and park areas are visited and used by people from all over the entire United States; so this is a national problem.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 19 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to state that this is the first experience I have had on the agricultural subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. I have enjoyed that experience very much. I have enjoyed working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and I think we have come up with a report which will receive the support of a majority of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Appropriations Committee began its hearings on the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill on Wednesday, February 25, 1953. Our committee was in session each day up to and including Tuesday, May 5, 1953. During these hearings we took over 3,000 pages of testimony, which is included in parts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the hearing records which are before you as you consider this agriculture appropriations bill today. Each witness was given every courtesy by our subcommittee chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. This bill was very carefully reviewed by the subcommittee and by the entire House Appropriations Committee.

The bill includes direct annual appropriations for regular activities of the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1954, totaling \$712,308,328; loan authorizations for the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farmers' Home Administration of \$402,500,000; administrative expense authorizations for the corporations of the Department in the amount of \$21,005,000; and an appropriation of \$439,500 for the special activities of the Department. The amount recommended in this bill for the 1954 fiscal year for the activities of the Department of Agriculture is \$24,301,505 less than the funds available for 1953 and \$37,101,014 less than the budget estimates submitted to this Congress by former President Truman for fiscal 1954. These savings are made notwithstanding the fact that the addition of an entirely new item of \$29,250,000 for acreage controls on wheat and cotton was not carried in the 1953 budget, nor was this item carried in the original budget estimates for fiscal year 1954. At the time the budget for 1954 was originally drawn, no provision was made for acreage controls on wheat and cotton but it is now necessary under the law for the Department of Agriculture to have these funds so that it is possible for them to make necessary provisions for acreage controls on wheat and cotton in the next crop year.

Our committee was not unanimous on every item in this appropriations bill. As a matter of fact, there are several items which were included at a higher

figure in this budget bill than I thought was absolutely necessary. I do feel, however, that it is an outstanding committee report and one which will certainly provide for all services which the Federal Government should provide. I support this committee report.

There is no question in my mind that agriculture, occupying the important place that it does in our Nation's economy, is concerned about the fact that our Federal budget has not been balanced, with the exception of one year, over the past 20 years. The farmers making up this great agricultural economy of ours have a widespread feeling in my section of the country that our Federal budget must be balanced.

Back some 15 years ago, the Department of Agriculture spent more money than our Defense Department. For 2 years prior to World War II and since Pearl Harbor, the Department of Defense, of course, has greatly exceeded the spending of the Department of Agriculture because the functions of this Department became more important to our immediate national security. In the past fiscal year we have obligated in foreign aid funds six times as much in dollars and cents than the Federal Government has obligated through the Department of Agriculture. The appropriations to the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1954 are considerably below those appropriations made to the Department of Agriculture on a functional basis for fiscal year 1940. The number of employees of the Department of Agriculture is well below the 1940 employment figure for the Department of Agriculture. This is true for no other major department in our Government, but this fact in itself cannot be used as a justification of the present budget.

In drawing up a budget for the Department of Agriculture, it was necessary for the Secretary of Agriculture and for the Appropriations Committee to take into account the following considerations:

First. Mandatory requirements of the law must be fully and faithfully executed and activities essential to a sound agricultural economy should be maintained.

Second. Research programs should be strengthened and redirected to make maximum contribution to current problems, with full recognition of State, local, and private participation in research and scientific development work.

Third. Savings should be made by finding more economic and efficient methods of operation.

Fourth. Every effort should be made to withdraw or curtail Federal expenditures for activities where State and local governments and private enterprise can and should assume more responsibility.

The task of reducing expenditures in the Department of Agriculture is not an easy one. It is a task, however, which is not impossible and one which must be faced up to in all departments of the Federal Government if this country is to remain strong as a nation. The present administration has inherited a \$267 billion national debt. In addition to this, the Eisenhower administration inherited \$90 billion in unspent authorizations which had been approved by

previous sessions of Congress, but were not reflected in the national debt figure.

The financial position of our country as the new administration takes over is indeed not good. A policy of deficit financing has been built up here in Washington to the point where it has become an accepted philosophy to pass on to our children and grandchildren the debts which we accumulate today in the form of a huge Federal mortgage levied against their future. Many individuals seem to think that we should keep on spending and spending today so that we can have a good living. The idea seems to be that we should let future generations pay the bills for our good living today. My primary concern in carrying out my duties and responsibilities as a representative of the Seventh Wisconsin Congressional District is to do my part to restore a sound economy to our country. We must balance our Federal budget. We must work to reduce our Federal indebtedness. We must reinstate the principle of good common sense in meeting the problems which confront us as a nation. We must stop running to Washington with our hands outstretched every time a local problem confronts us. There is no pot of gold in Washington, D. C. There are only debts and mortgages which have been piled up by the State and local governments running to Washington with their problems, by military and foreign-aid spending, and by corruption, dishonesty, inefficiency, and waste during the past 20 years.

In my work on the Appropriations Committee, I have kept foremost in my mind the pledges which I made as a candidate for Congress last summer and fall in each of the 10 counties in my congressional district. I pledged to the people of my district that I would do all in my power to do away with the principle of deficit financing in our Federal Government. This can and must be done during the next 2 years. It can be done by everyone's realizing that one of our greatest dangers during this period is not the threat of war, but the even greater danger of spending ourselves into bankruptcy, which would lead us to complete chaos. We could deliver ourselves to international communism without having a shot fired upon us. We can balance our budget by: First, cutting those sections of our budget which have become out of balance since 1940. Second, present and past spending authorizations of all departments must be continually reviewed and curtailed by the executive department.

The budget of the Department of Agriculture in 1940, as approved by Congress, authorized a total expenditure of \$1,653,000,000. The budget of the Department of Agriculture in 1953 provided for a total spending authorization of \$1,519,000,000. The Department of Agriculture is the only major department of Government which does not reflect a considerable increase over funds authorized in 1940, but, in fact, shows a decrease. This is true despite the fact that in 1953 the Department of Agriculture was charged with losses of \$182 million, due to the International Wheat Agreement, and \$83.4 million as a re-

sult of direct appropriations to the national school-lunch program—this figure exclusive of agricultural surpluses transferred to the school-lunch program by use of section 32 funds in the amount of \$50 million in 1953.

The deliberations of our committee as to the financial needs of the Department of Agriculture, together with its related activities, have been centered around the basic need for preserving a prosperous agriculture. This is not limited solely to those engaged in agriculture, but is one of the basic economic problems facing our entire Nation. In this bill we have given consideration to the pressing problems of agriculture, including the need for research in the dairy industry, the need for increased attention to conserving soil of the Nation, the need for basic agricultural research, and the need for a continued high production of agricultural commodities to meet the food requirements of a constantly increasing population.

CONSERVATION OF SOIL

In my work on the committee, I continually was aware of the fine work of the Soil Conservation Service, and the technical and professional help which the Soil Conservation Service has provided the farmers throughout our Nation. The work of the Soil Conservation Service has helped to conserve and protect our soil, which is the greatest physical asset we as a nation possess.

All members of our committee agreed that increased attention should be given to soil-conservation practices of a more permanent nature which add to the value of our soil over a long period of time. Too much emphasis has been placed, particularly in some of our Southern and Western States, on agricultural conservation practices which have only a temporary influence upon a long-range conservation program. The committee recognized that a national program should be encouraged which would place more emphasis on permanent-type practices. The committee recognized, however, that the application of such a national policy at the local level would not be entirely uniform, since the permanent value of certain practices will vary in different areas of the country.

All commitments made for the agricultural-conservation program for crop year 1953 will be fully met by the Department of Agriculture, and the committee has arrived at a compromise figure which will authorize a maximum of \$195 million for the agricultural-conservation program for the 1954 crop year. This is \$55 million below the recommendation of the former Secretary of Agriculture, but \$55 million above the recommendations of Secretary Benson. Under the new program there is some question as to how much of the maximum authorization of \$195 million will be actually used. County committees throughout the country are giving consideration to the program for crop year 1954 and will be making their recommendations to the Department. It is impossible to estimate exactly what the total program will cost for 1954.

The budget authorizations for the Soil Conservation Service for 1954 take into

account the fact that the new soil-conservation districts have not been organized as rapidly as originally estimated. The appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service is in contemplation of the development of a plan for the transfer of Soil Conservation Service nurseries, now maintained for the distribution of seeds and tree-planting stock, to soil-conservation districts or other State or local associations or groups who may be ready and willing to take them over.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Perhaps the most important work of the Department of Agriculture is in the field of research. Research has played an important role in the development of agriculture. The contribution of research in solving many of the immediate and long-range problems facing agriculture cannot be minimized. Our committee has attempted to avoid any substantial reductions in this essential work. While the research items have been reduced somewhat below the original budget, our committee's recommendations represent an increase over the 1953 budget for research activities of approximately \$2½ million. The Secretary of Agriculture will reexamine the work of the Department of Agriculture in the field of research in relation to the work now being done by the States and by private industry. Secretary Benson has assured us that he will see that these funds are expended in the most effective way possible. In this bill there is a total of \$58,177,000 provided for agricultural research activities. Increased emphasis is placed on the Department's research activities in cooperation with the State agricultural experiment stations, and with other research agencies, both public and private. Increased emphasis is also placed on the research work now being carried out on dairy products and the important problems facing the dairy industry.

Research work in the Bureau of Dairy Industry has been stepped up by an increase of \$69,445 over the 1953 budget. This will enable the Bureau to step up its research program in nonfat-milk solids, cheese, and new milk products. The Bureau brought out in testimony before our committee that this work would be carried on in cooperation with the University of Wisconsin's new Babcock Laboratory.

The committee has attempted to make provisions for all urgent research projects presented to it and expects the Department to use the authority granted to it by Congress to transfer funds from other activities to meet any additional acute problems which may arise during fiscal year 1954 in this most important work.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Those funds necessary to carry out the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation in fiscal year 1954 have been provided in this bill. The price-support program, which continues in effect throughout fiscal year 1954, will be administered by the Department in accordance with the intent of Congress. This law provides for the support of basic agricultural products at 90 percent parity, and of dairy products at from 75 to 90 percent of parity. The Secretary of

Agriculture announced soon after taking office that dairy products would be supported at 90 percent of parity from April 1, 1953, to April 1, 1954.

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

Adequate funds are provided in this bill for the Rural Electrification Administration and for the Farmers Home Administration. The total maximum loan funds provided in this bill for these two agencies amounts to \$402,500,000. One hundred and ninety million dollars is available for electrification loans and \$50 million is made available for telephone loans by the Rural Electrification Administration. The Farmers Home Administration in fiscal year 1954 will have available for farm ownership and housing loans, a total of \$35,500,000; for product and subsistence loans, \$120 million; and for water facility loans, \$7 million.

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

The bill provides for a total direct appropriation of \$83,365,000 for the school-lunch program. This is the same amount as was available in fiscal year 1953. In addition to this direct appropriation, there will be made available approximately \$65 million in surplus commodities to the school-lunch program. The Commodity Credit Corporation will be reimbursed for these commodities from section 32 funds. It is interesting to note that, as far as the school-lunch program is concerned, the Federal Government's contribution has greatly increased during the past 2 years to the cost of this program. In fiscal year 1952, the total Federal contribution to this program was \$100 million; in fiscal year 1953 the Federal contribution to this program was in excess of \$133,400,000; in 1954, the estimated total contribution on the part of the Federal Government to the program will be approximately \$147,000,000.

It is my personal feeling that if the Federal Government is ever to reduce our Federal tax burden and return to the States tax sources for their exclusive use, the individual States will soon be required to bear more of the cost of this program. In 1952, the total contribution by State and local government to this program was \$54.4 million; in 1953, the total contribution by State and local government will be approximately \$60 million; and, in fiscal year 1954, the estimate of the contribution by State and local government to the cost of this program is approximately \$65 million. Almost one-third of our school children are covered by this program. State and local government will be required to make more of a contribution to this popular program in the future if we are to carry out the recommendations made by the Council of State Governments and governors of the various States.

FOREST SERVICE

In this budget there is included an increase in the amount of funds made available for fiscal year 1954 to the Forest Service. Five million dollars were provided in the third supplemental appropriation bill for the Forest Service to construct access roads. Additional funds are made available for access roads

in this appropriation bill because of the seriousness of the infestation of Engelmann spruce-bark beetle now spreading very rapidly in spruce timber in national forests in Idaho and Montana; and of Douglas-fir beetle, which is causing widespread damage to Douglas-fir in Oregon and Washington.

The Forest Service engages in three main lines of work: First, management, protection, and development of national forests; second, cooperation with States and private forest landowners in connection with fire protection, forest tree planting, forest management, and extension; and third, forest and range research. Several years ago the Congress inserted language authorizing the institution of cooperative arrangements with States and local organizations relative to research stations and experimental forests. The committee feels that the Forest Service should continue to expand this means of meeting the research needs in those areas not now covered by existing appropriations.

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

The Production and Marketing Administration has been provided with adequate funds to carry out the agricultural adjustment programs, Sugar Act, School Lunch Act, removal of surplus commodities, and marketing services, which have been previously authorized by Congress. Funds have been provided as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out that authority delegated to the Production and Marketing Administration to administer price support and related programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The responsibility for the major policy in carrying out the agricultural conservation program has been recently transferred to the Assistant Secretary in charge of research, extension, and land use activities of the Department.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

The Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations will be revitalized and reorganized so as to serve the original and primary purpose of this agency. That original purpose was to provide information regarding supplies and prices of agricultural products in foreign markets and smoothing the economic and diplomatic paths over which export products go. It is particularly important that this be done at this time in view of the difficulties experienced in maintaining foreign markets for American farm products. In the past few years, this service has been very ineffective and it is hoped that the reorganization by the present Secretary of Agriculture will restore the effectiveness of this agency.

It is my sincere hope that the House will act favorably upon the report of our committee on the Agricultural Appropriations bill for 1954. This report is supported by each member of our subcommittee, realizing full well the importance of agriculture and its related activities to our whole economy.

In seven separate instances, we have given notice in our report that specific control activities of the Department of Agriculture must revert to the States and become the responsibility of the States. We have given notice so that the States can assume the responsibility in the

future for several of these control programs.

As a member of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, I assure you, my colleagues here in the House, that I have worked diligently to eliminate unnecessary expenditures of Federal funds by the Department of Agriculture.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, has impressed me in his appearances before our committee. He seems to me to be one of the most able, conscientious, and outstanding members of President Eisenhower's new Cabinet. He has a thorough understanding and interest in the problems of agriculture because of his long background and experience as a farmer. His patriotic and religious devotion to his country is something that I admire and respect. I have great confidence in his administrative ability and the leadership he will give this important Department of our Government. I say this not because I represent a dairy district and we at last have a Secretary of Agriculture who recognizes the importance of the dairy industry, but because of the impression that he left with all members of our committee of his awareness and knowledge of our entire agricultural economy. His task is indeed a difficult one. The problems he has inherited are not of his own making. He has solicited the help of all of us regardless of political label, and it is our duty to help him in every way possible.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman has made a splendid address, and in connection with it I should like to call attention to a fact that has not been expressed here today, and that is that the bill before us has a net decrease in personnel below 1953 of 1,469 positions.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for including that important information.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I also would like to say that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] will, in my opinion, become a worthy successor to his predecessor, the late Reid Murray, who was held in high esteem by the Members of this House.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield.

Mr. HUNTER. I wish to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin on his very forthright and very informative statement. Like myself, he is a new member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture. I have enjoyed my association with him tremendously and I feel the gentleman has made a very concrete and very valuable contribution to the work of our subcommittee.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, the vigorous progress in agriculture in this country during the last half century is a monument to agricultural research. It has been a continuous battle to keep ahead of ravages of insects and diseases and the depletion of soil fertility. Unfortunately, research frequently does not receive the support to put an army on the field until the battalions of diseases and pests have virtually won the battle.

The history of the sugarcane crop in Louisiana provides a good example of such a situation. During the early twenties, Louisiana was producing good crops of cane, providing about 300,000 tons of sugar a year. Even then a few people recognized that serious diseases were threatening. These enemies in the form of sugarcane mosaic, red rot, and root rots struck rather suddenly and viciously. By 1926 sugar production in Louisiana had dwindled to a mere 48,000 tons. An entire industry faced liquidation. Vigorous cooperative research efforts by the United States Department of Agriculture, the Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station, and the American Sugar Cane League resulted in the importation of several disease-tolerant varieties that saved the day and the initiation of research toward breeding disease-resistant varieties. Louisiana is now producing about 400,000 tons of sugar annually from varieties of cane developed at the United States Sugar Plant Field Station in Canal Point, Fla.

New and ominous warnings are on the horizon, however. Two previously unreported diseases of sugarcane were found in Louisiana last year. Should we wait and see whether or not these diseases ravish a productive agricultural crop, or should we protect Louisiana farmers by supporting the necessary research to combat these diseases?

It is granted that there have been tremendous increases in appropriations for agriculture during the past two decades. Let us consider how production research on sugarcane has been affected: In 1933, the Bureau of Plant Industry had funds to support 18 scientists working on this crop; by 1941, the number was down to 14; and by 1952 funds were available to carry only 7 scientists. The pending bill would not only result in a further reduction in force but would make other drastic cuts in our research program.

NEED FOR WORK

During the past 25 years the per capita consumption of sugar in the United States has averaged about 100 pounds, and the estimated consumption for 1953 is 8,200,000 tons.

During the 4-year period from 1948 to 1951, the average annual production of sugar in the continental United States and its possessions has been approximately 4,380,000 tons or about 55 percent of the total consumption within the United States. During the same period the annual production of beet and cane sugar within the continental United States was 2,070,000 tons or only one-

fourth of the current annual rate of consumption in the United States.

Every time this country has become involved in a war, sugar is the first item of food to become rationed. The serious stresses of national emergency provide indisputable evidence of the importance of maintaining a vigorous and economically sound domestic sugar industry.

Since our native sugar crops are produced in direct competition with foreign countries where wages and living standards are comparatively low, it is mandatory that the American farmer be able to produce sugar with maximum efficiency, particularly in view of the relatively high capital investment and high wage rates that he has to face. It is, therefore, highly essential to continue efforts to breed superior varieties of sugarcane having hybrid vigor, resistance to disease, high sucrose content, outstanding keeping qualities in storage and adaptable to mechanical field operations.

The Sugar Advisory Committee on Production, Marketing, and Research at each meeting for the past 4 years has emphasized and reemphasized the need for an expanding research breeding program on sugarcane and sugar beets. The Committee stated unqualifiedly that it gave that recommendation the highest priority in the entire field of sugar research.

MAINLAND CANE PRODUCTION

The State of Louisiana produces about 270,000 acres of sugarcane annually and Florida about 36,000. The sugar produced in those 2 States has an average annual value of about \$58 million. In addition to sugar, these 2 States produce about 45 million gallons of molasses annually, with a present value of about 10½ cents to 11 cents per gallon; also about 750,000 tons of bagasse which is used in the manufacture of wallboard, poultry litter, and will be used for the manufacture of paper and dissolving pulp within another year upon completion of a plant which is now being constructed for that purpose in Louisiana.

In order for Louisiana and Florida cane growers to successfully compete with offshore areas having low standards of living, it is essential that production be maintained at the highest possible level of efficiency.

Varieties of cane that produce well in Louisiana and Florida must be somewhat different from those grown in other sugarcane areas in the world. They must mature early, having resistance to cold, and be adaptable to mechanical harvesting in addition to resistance to numerous diseases, such as mosaic, chlorotic streak, red rot, root rot, and so forth. Thus, major emphasis should be given to the breeding program and to isolating and characterizing the strains and varieties of sugarcane that are especially valuable as superior parents.

BREEDING IS COMPLICATED AND EXPENSIVE

Sugarcane breeding is expensive work. For instance, it has been shown that only 1 out of about 250,000 sugarcane seedlings becomes a promising variety. At the present rate of variety yield, deterioration and the ominous threat of diseases, there is an urgent demand by sugarcane growers for the development of several

potentially superior varieties of sugarcane per year.

By using present personnel and facilities to the utmost during 1952, the combined efforts of Louisiana, Florida, and the United States Department of Agriculture permitted the production and testing of only 75,000 new seedlings which is less than one-third of the number that should be tested in order to meet the varietal needs of the industry.

The primary obstacle to sugarcane breeding is that only a very few existing varieties will bloom in the United States. Consequently, research is urgently needed to ascertain the physiological basis for flower production in sugarcane and to initiate research to find out how to artificially stimulate bloom.

URGENT DEMAND FOR NEW VARIETIES

Existing varieties of sugarcane are continually degenerating and the demand is urgent for new varieties. A variety that is outstanding today will probably be worthless 10 years from now. Research is needed to ascertain why varieties degenerate and whether or not it can be prevented. If a way could be found to prevent degeneration of varieties it would relieve to a certain extent the demand for such a large sugarcane-breeding program.

Varieties of sugarcane being developed must be rigorously tested for sugarcane diseases now present in the United States and also for those that may possibly be introduced and become disastrous to the domestic industry. During recent months two previously unreported diseases of sugarcane have been discovered in Louisiana. One is a virus causing a stunted growth and is regarded as the most serious disease of cane in Australia. The other is a mildew disease that is serious in the canefields of Peru.

IMPORTANT ITEMS

One of the most important items in the budget is a \$50,000 fund for building additional greenhouse facilities at field stations in Florida and Louisiana. These additional greenhouse facilities will eliminate one of the main bottlenecks in the present breeding program which is greatly hampered by the inadequacies of such facilities.

Another most important item is the establishment of a secondary quarantine station in Florida where imported canes can be kept under strict observation until all possibility of infection has been eliminated. Although canes imported for breeding purposes are subjected to strict quarantine regulations before they are sent to the Government experiment station at Canal Point, Fla., for use in the breeding program, there have been instances where the first quarantine was not adequate to prevent introduction of disease. The growth-stunting virus from Australian cane undoubtedly would have been discovered and eliminated in a secondary quarantine station like the one proposed.

ADEQUATE FUNDS ESSENTIAL

What I have said about the importance of agricultural research to our sugarcane industry applies with equal force in connection with all other agricultural crops. For instance, the present bill carries an item of \$119,000 for

sweetpotato weevil control and research, as compared to \$238,000 carried in last year's appropriation bill. This is a cut of exactly 50 percent. I appeared before the subcommittee and vigorously protested this wholly unjustified reduction.

The work done by the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine Laboratory at Southwestern Louisiana Institute in Lafayette, in charge of Mr. C. H. Gaddis, has been of immense value to the sweetpotato growers in my district. At present experiments are being conducted to determine possibilities of field control of the weevil, and considerable testing and evaluation must be done before a definite program can be placed in operation for effective and economic field control. I do not consider it to be sound economy to render practically useless much of the groundwork that has been laid by curtailing the program at this time and not carrying to a successful conclusion a project in which so much has already been accomplished, but in which the possibilities for still greater service are so evident.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to be penny wise and pound foolish. I believe that the present economy move is being carried on too far too fast when we are asked to cut the budget so severely for agricultural research. I commend the Committee on Appropriations for its efforts to economize and to try to bring the budget in balance, but I suggest that to cripple our agricultural program at its very foundation in the field of research is the wrong approach.

In this instance the committee has recommended an amount wholly inadequate to sustain life in the goose which has laid so many precious golden eggs for the farmers and the taxpayers of the United States. The amount recommended by the committee is not only far below the figure suggested by the so-called Truman budget, but is also out of line with the recommendations of President Eisenhower. I submit that these severe cuts should be restored on the floor of the House. Specifically, at least \$150,000 should be allocated for sugar plant research and at least \$238,000, the amount we appropriated last year, should be set aside for sweetpotato weevil control and research.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

There are a few things in this bill that I wish to call attention to, and I shall not be very long.

In order that we may have some idea of what the so-called ACP picture is, which is called by some a soil conservation program, I would like at this point to read a letter which went out to all of the major representatives of the Limestone Trust on April 20, 1953. It was signed by Robert M. Koch, executive secretary of the trust.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIMESTONE

INSTITUTE, INC.,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1953.

MEMBERSHIP LETTER NO. 14

The ACP situation has reached a critical point. Both pro and anti groups are making all-out supreme efforts to either save it or drastically curtail it.

The Benson administration has finally reduced its policy on ACP to writing. ACP Memorandum 5 has been issued to State offices with instructions to send it to county offices by April 30. We will have it in your hands before then.

Briefly it puts an end to our National ACP limestone program. From now on you would be on your own to sell your product. Limestone could be used in a few cases but in my opinion the total purchased would not exceed 2 million tons and probably would only be half this amount. You would have to market the other 26 or 27 million tons without any financial assistance.

Some of you may want to buy earth moving equipment as the Benson administration proposes to put a great deal more money into that type of practice.

The Farm Bureau is spending a great deal of money to bring key farmers to Washington to testify, interview their Congressmen and have friendly banquets with their State Congressional delegations. This is very potent and extremely difficult to combat.

Members recently received a letter dated April 3 and April 16 addressed "To Persons Interested in the ACP." These were sent to you for your information but were primarily for the 3,000 county PMA offices, State offices, etc. We have been asked for hundreds of additional copies. Some of you, no doubt, think parts of the letters were too strong. Gentlemen, in my opinion you must fight fire with fire. We are in a last-ditch fight and only Congress can save this program now. To offset the tremendously well-planned tactics of the farm bureau we need extensive grass roots support.

It is coming. Only time will determine the results. We are definitely gaining, although TABER is wielding a big club on his full committee—he has a 10-man majority with a large part of it his own handpicked men. His battle cry upon entering the hearing room the other day was "not 1 cent more than Secretary Benson wants." So the bill may get cut to \$140 million in his full Appropriations Committee, even though the Subcommittee on Agriculture passes a larger amount. If it gets cut to \$140 million there will be a floor fight to restore it to \$200 million. In my opinion we will win this by a very close vote if supporters of the program continue their efforts right up to the moment of the vote, which now is scheduled the week of May 11.

In addition to fighting for a substantial appropriation, I am trying to get directives written into the report of the committee to block the Benson policy of having no lime program. Be sure and keep this letter confidential.

Enclosed is a reprint of Senator MORSE's address at our banquet last January. Every limestone producer ought to be familiar with the basic tenets of Senator MORSE's philosophy on soil conservation. Additional copies are available at \$2 per hundred.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. KOCH,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to ask the gentleman in regard to the letter he was reading if he did not think that the reference to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was what you might call the climax of the letter?

Mr. TABER. No; I think that perhaps the climax might be—

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, I insist with my good friend, that is one of the high points; I want to insist that that is one of the high points.

Mr. TABER. No; the high point was when he wanted to protect the Lime-

stone Trust and be sure that the Limestone people would not have any work to do amongst the farmers to sell it. That was really the climax of it, and that was his chief objective.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I understand that the gentleman from Minnesota in control of the time on the other side has used all of his time. We have not used all of our time and I would be glad to have the time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] taken out of our time. We are very fond of the gentleman from New York even though we had a tough job to get some provisions in this bill reported out over his opposition. But we would be glad to share our time with him.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We have allotted 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it is highly significant that in his letter Mr. Koch says to his people that if the Government cannot be forced to assume limestone sales costs then "you would have to market the other twenty-six or twenty-seven million tons without any financial assistance."

It indicates that the authorization contracts with farmers for payments in fiscal year 1955, which appears in the sum of \$195 million on page 31, line 14, of the agriculture appropriation bill, is for about 27 million tons of limestone at a cost to the Government of at least \$40 million. The Limestone Trust is the chief beneficiary of this appropriation alleged to be for the benefit of the farmers. That alone should be enough to indicate how thinking Members of the House who had a sense of responsibility to the people should vote.

Let us analyze the picture a little further. Of the farmers who now get Federal checks out of this setup, 392,774 receive checks of \$20 or less. The number in this category has dropped from 789,000 since 1948. There are 538,552 receiving checks of from between \$20.01 to \$40; this figure has dropped from 748,000 since 1948. The number receiving from \$40 to \$60 is 412,085, and this has dropped since 1949 from 478,000, indicating a rapidly lessening interest in the program on the part of the small farmers. In fact, 1,343,411 of the 2,563,956 recipient farmers, or 52 percent of the total number, received less than \$60, indicating that it means practically nothing to the farmers who receive the checks. The big beneficiary is not the farmer but the Limestone Trust.

It is very doubtful that the farmer who receives less than \$60 would ever go into the central county office and fill out all of the papers and go through all of the redtape that is required to qualify him for this program. But the members of the PMA and the local farm county committee have been receiving per diem and travel allowance from Federal funds for going out and soliciting farmers to sign these applications. If these members of the county committees and the local committees were not allowed to go out and so solicit farmers, the applications would never be made and the administrative expenses which

are charged up against this appropriation for operating this program would be cut by at least \$10 million. There is a certain amount of "velvet" in this for the members of the committees but the major beneficiary is still the Limestone Trust. This is established beyond dispute by their own statements quoted above from their lobbyist letter to their membership; \$140 million with only \$16 million out for expenses would leave \$124 million for the farmers if they did not have to take care of the Limestone Trust.

Agriculture is a major industry and it should have every possible consideration and I am willing to give it every possible consideration but the budget of the United States is so far behind that we need to catch up. I am sure that the farmers of this Nation are aware of the financial stress of the Government and are willing to cooperate and try to solve the problem.

It is thus apparent that there is really very little actual benefit to the farmers involved. I believe these farmers who receive these small checks are ashamed to take the money and this is not a genuine soil-conservation program but a limestone selling scheme program. The Farm Bureau, the National Grange, and many other local farm units have indicated that they favor a reduction in this item. I believe that 90 percent of the farmers in America would feel that way. Not more than one-third of the farmers in America get a check above \$60 and only a very few get a check as high as \$150—you can count them very easily in any community.

Why should we continue this enormous complicated operation on such an elaborate basis at a time when the financial credit of our Government is at stake? I am in hopes that when we get to reading this bill for amendment that the membership of the House will follow what I believe to be the desire of the farmers and not allow themselves to be influenced by pressure on the part of the limestone trust, or by those who are more interested in selfish considerations than they are in the welfare of the farmers and their country.

Every other department of the Government has taken a budget reduction in a cooperative spirit. Secretary Benson tried to effect a reduction on what he believed to be a fair and workable basis. Why shouldn't we permit this reduction to go into effect and restore the revised budget estimate of \$140 million at this point?

I know that the farmers will probably continue to use limestone if they need it on their land even if there is a reduction in the amount of Federal assistance—most of them always have used it where it was desired.

Frankly, I am in favor of the soil-conservation program where the Department lays out a program to protect the soil. But why we should go on with this program is something that it is very difficult for me to see, especially when you take into consideration the crisis we are in at the present time. It is altogether different from the price-support program, it is altogether different from anything that is involved in the acreage-control proposition.

We must consider also that notwithstanding that there was an authorization of \$250 million in contracts left, the use of it and the followup of it has dropped so steadily in the last 3 or 4 years that I can see no possible reason with the declining interest in it on the part of the farmer for our going above the \$140 million. It will not stand a real analysis.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, of course, I cannot agree with what the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has just said in his address to the Committee. There is a complete disagreement between my good chairman and myself as to what is needed for the preservation of our soils. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is entitled to his opinion and he is never backward about expressing his viewpoint. He is courageous, but in this instance, and in my personal opinion, he is mistaken. There has been no indication that I know of that the so-called Limestone Trust has had any effect whatsoever upon the deliberations of my subcommittee or upon any individual member thereof. I repeat, what I said previously today, that if it is not worthwhile to expend one-third of what it costs annually to keep one combat division in operation for the preservation of our soils in these United States of America, then it is time that we reorient our line of thinking. We, on our subcommittee, are trying to prevent the coming of the time when there may not be sufficient food to feed this great Nation of ours, including the constituents of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. We are looking for a solution of how we can produce food for an additional 35 million people in 12 or 15 years' time. We know that means securing the production from an additional 115 million acres by 1965, 12 years from now. It is my opinion that we should leave to the determination of the various States, individually, as to whether or not they wish to have limestone application as one of their practices. We know that many States do want that right given to them. Personally, we do not use much limestone in Minnesota, but at the same time I see no reason whatsoever to say to the Northeastern States, who depend upon the application of limestone to put their soil in shape so that they can produce legumes, that they cannot use limestone if they so decide.

Mr. Chairman, whether or not we like what we call the ACP program, I think it is time for this Congress of the United States to think this thing out clearly to the end and not be drawn down the wrong highway, on a tangent, simply because of some letter that somebody has written. Let us keep in mind the basic problem, and that is, to keep our soil in such shape so that the people of this Nation, your children and grandchildren and mine will have as good food and as much food 50 years from now as we are blessed with today. No program is perfect. We do hope to improve, from year to year, our soil-conservation programs.

Our report, accompanying this bill, says:

The committee believes that the soil is our greatest physical asset and that everything possible must be done to protect and conserve it.

Our committee further states, page 10 of the report:

The committee has felt for many years that increased attention should be given to those practices which have more than annual benefits to the soil. It is recognized, however, that application of such a national policy at the local level will not be entirely uniform since the permanent value of certain practices will vary in different areas of the country.

May I, in conclusion, call to your attention that the full Appropriations Committee defeated the motion to reduce the agricultural conservation program for 1954 from \$195 million to \$40 million. I hope and feel sure that the House will sustain this action for the good of the future of our Nation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to get into the general debate on this bill, but I was interested and prompted to do so by the remarks of my valued friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] when he referred to a Limestone Trust. We have heard the same kind of remarks on previous occasions during past years when the agricultural appropriation bill was up for consideration in the House. As a result of remarks made in the past, and which I anticipated would again be made on this occasion, and they were, I took occasion to find out for myself just what kind of a Limestone Trust there was in this country.

There is a Limestone Association, but there is a National Association of Manufacturers. There are various chambers of commerce, locally and nationally. There are various trade organizations in business and associations in other spheres of human activity in the United States. I do not consider them to be trusts.

My investigation of the limestone industry shows that there are about 1,100 producers of agricultural limestone in the country. That certainly would not indicate a trust. I also found, for example, that during the period 1935 to 1939, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the average price was \$4.09 per ton delivered to the farmer. On the basis of figures available for the 1952 period, the comparative price was \$3.22 per ton, in spite of the increased cost. Freight rates during that period increased 78 percent. Other increases have taken place. When there is a trust usually it is a monopoly, there is close control, and prices usually are raised. Certainly the evidence in the case of the limestone industry does not impress me with the fact that there is any trust existing.

It is very easy to make the charge, but the facts certainly do not support the charge. With 1,100 producers of agricultural limestone, there is a very highly competitive situation existing throughout the country. That certainly

is reflected in the lower price the farmer pays for limestone, at least based on the 1952 figures, as compared with what the farmer paid in prior years.

It is true they have an association. There is nothing wrong with that. Whether or not every limestone producer belongs to the association is something I cannot say. But we have associations of businessmen, various kinds of associations, which are perfectly proper and desirable. Simply because thousands of business concerns might belong to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States does not take away their competitive standing, their competitive ability. The fact they are members of associations like that or any other association does not make that association a trust.

With all due regard to the views of my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. TABER], I think that in this case he is seriously wrong, that his charges of a trust are not supported by the facts. If he argues that an association constitutes a trust, then that is a different situation, but I doubt very much if anybody would pay much attention to a charge that an association of businessmen, properly formed, as this one is, constitutes a trust. I doubt that such a charge could carry much weight in the minds of the Members of this House or anyone else.

So my few remarks, for whatever value they may have, are to convey to the Members of the House the information which to me clearly shows there is a limestone industry in the United States. I am glad there is. But by no means is it a limestone trust.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Assuming that it is just an innocent association, does the gentleman condone the letter that was read?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nothing wrong with the letter I heard read. If I were writing the letter I probably would write it differently. Knowing my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I would certainly not make any reference to him as "TABER." But if I did not know him and was writing a letter, I see where I might, and without intending to reflect upon him.

So far as the gentleman from Massachusetts is concerned, there is no one in this House of Representatives or in this country who has a higher respect for the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] than the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. I may disagree with the gentleman, but in my disagreement I shall never be disagreeable. But in this respect, I think the facts do not justify the charge that there is a limestone trust in the United States.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I believe in soil conservation, and having worked on this committee and having studied the subject for many years—as I see it, we have not taken care of our country as we should. I welcome the efforts of any and all in the direction that I think that we all should look, and I

think that is toward taking better care of our land and toward restoring our land. I trust the people of no community in this country and of no county and/or State would select limestone use as a practice unless there was a need in that area for limestone. Certainly nobody wishes it on any community. Certainly it is a waste of time for the farmer to spend his money and his effort and his labor because the Government pays only about a third of the total cost of application unless he is convinced it is needed on his own farm. The testimony is that the benefits of limestone last from 7 to 8 years depending upon the use that is made of it. What kind of crop is grown on the land and what part of it they take out. It is surprising how great a part of the United States has a need for some basic element in the soil. I happen to know the individual who wrote that letter. He works for his association. I do not blame him for working for them, but sometimes I question whether his efforts, as in this letter, are as effective as they might be. I believe I could have written a whole lot better letter personally if I had the same interest that he has. I do not have that same interest, but I do have the interest of the American people and the Nation at heart when I say we should give more attention to the soil.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK].

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, when I asked for time to speak this afternoon, I had no idea I would get into the middle of a controversy with reference to the National Limestone Association. May I say that in the district I have the honor to represent, there are a number of limestone producers. Whether they all belong to the National Limestone Association, I do not know. I do know that many of these limestone producers in the Sixth Congressional District of Ohio are farmers who as a side line have opened limestone quarries and are supplying their neighbors with agricultural lime. May I say that to my knowledge, the limestone interests in the State of Ohio have rendered an outstanding service to the farmers. They have carried on a very comprehensive campaign to encourage farmers to put more land in permanent pasture. Of course, to do that requires a considerable amount of lime. They have carried on this educational campaign for a number of years and have been very beneficial. I am sure the National Limestone Association has participated in this program, and like former Chairman WHITTEN, I have met Mr. Robert A. Koch, the executive secretary of the National Limestone Association, and I have always found him to be a very courteous, capable young man. He has never so far as I know brought any pressure upon me as far as any legislation is concerned.

I want to say that my observation of his activities before the Congress have shown him to be a very fine gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say that the gentleman from Massachusetts does

not have a farm in his district. There are no limestone interests in my district. I think there is some limestone in Massachusetts, up in the vicinity of Lee, probably 75 or 125 miles from my district. Like the gentleman from Ohio, I have absolutely no interest other than an objective interest, and certainly I would not accuse a chamber of commerce of being a trust. I may disagree with their resolutions, but I thoroughly respect them as a business association. Certainly I feel the same way toward the National Limestone Association. An association is one thing; a trust is another.

Mr. POLK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

There is another benefit that has come to the farmers through the activities of the National Limestone Association. I can remember a few years ago it was impossible for farmers to secure ground limestone that was fine enough to do the job on the farm. They were trying to sell ground limestone that was too coarse. To my personal knowledge I know that through the activities of the National Limestone Association they have carried on a program whereby ground limestone that is produced and placed on the market today is of sufficient fineness to meet the requirements of the agricultural colleges and State universities.

As I said, I did not plan to speak with reference to that particular item. Having served on the legislative Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives for more than 14 years, I am vitally concerned with the soil-conservation program. On yesterday I inserted in the Appendix of the Record a statement which appears on page A2700, in which I endeavored to show that the funds for the agricultural conservation program should be increased. I am somewhat concerned about the soil-conservation program that was announced by the United States Department of Agriculture on April 10, 1953. This proposed program for 1954 is included in what is entitled "ACP Memo No. 5, Development No. 1," a copy of which I hold in my hand. It was issued by the chief of the agricultural-conservation program and sets forth a guide for tentative developments of State and county programs for 1954.

Memorandum No. 5 is a 23-page bulletin and has been included in part IV of the hearings beginning at the bottom of page 1797 and continuing to the top of page 1808. It is 11 pages of fine print. Memorandum No. 5 spelled out the soil-conservation practices that will be approved for 1954. I do not criticize the practices that are included in memorandum 5. No doubt many are desirable practices for certain areas of the Nation. Only a few of them are applicable to the district and State I represent. I doubt if any Member representing a district east of Kansas and north of the Gulf States will find in Memorandum 5 many soil-conservation practices that will meet with the approval of the farmers he represents.

Naturally, I am most vitally interested in the Federal soil-conservation programs in the State of Ohio and espe-

cially those approved practices which will aid soil conservation in the sixth district of Ohio.

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] so ably pointed out this afternoon in his very comprehensive report to the House on this appropriation bill, the former procedure, one that was followed for many years by the Department of Agriculture, was to submit the problem of determining suitable soil-conservation practices to the people, first to the committees out in the various States, and after the committeemen in the States had had an opportunity to study this program the plans were sent to Washington and were approved here; in other words, we started at the ground and worked up. But in Memorandum 5 we have a reversal of that proposition, namely, an order from Washington telling farmers what they may do. Under the old program in Ohio in 1951—and that is the latest year for which all figures are available—there were 22 practices carried out by the farmers of my State. And may I say that liming was only 1 of the 22 practices. There were in this list of practices 12 that are included in Memorandum 5, but there are 10 that were carried out in Ohio in 1951 which are eliminated from Memorandum 5. I would like to read you the practices that are eliminated—and it happens that these practices that are eliminated are the ones that were most popular in Ohio.

The first practice that was eliminated is applying liming materials. Fifty-eight thousand nine hundred and fifty farms used that practice in Ohio in 1951; and may I say I am not going to read all of them, but you will find the figures I used in my testimony when I appeared before the Appropriations Committee on this item. You will find the information at page 556 of part 5 of the hearings.

The second practice that has been eliminated was applying phosphate. There were 51,710 farms on which that practice was carried out in 1951.

The third practice was applying potash and it was used on 43,493 farms.

Turning under green manure crops, 23,998 farms.

Seeding increased acreage of legumes and grass, 3,643 farms.

Contour farming, intertilled crops, 553 farms.

Contour farming, close-sown crops, 553 farms.

Clearing land, 605 farms.

Mulching orchards, and so forth, 1,052 farms.

Fencing for protection of woodlands, and so forth, 198 farms.

All of those items have been taken out of the program being approved for this year. So I repeat that I am deeply concerned about the present attitude of the administration with reference to these soil conservation programs. I think that this is one of the most important programs of the Government. In this program we do not give the farmer anything; we merely tell him that if he will spend \$2 or \$3 of his own money to protect the soil and its fertility, the Government will spend \$1 to help him out.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLK. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Even though certain practices have been eliminated in the gentleman's district and State, still this program will be of vital interest to the farmers of his State and will be very helpful even without the practices he spoke of. Is not that true?

Mr. POLK. May I say to the former chairman of the legislative Committee on Agriculture of the House, whom I hold in very high esteem, that from the figures I have been able to assemble it would appear that about 90 percent of the total practices that were carried out in Ohio in 1951 are eliminated—that is, taking the total number of farms under each practice—only about 10 percent of the practices that were carried out in 1951 can be carried out under this program. In other words, approximately 90 percent are being eliminated.

Mr. COOLEY. While that is entirely true, the fact remains the farmers who carried out these other practices in former years might carry out new practices under the program that is now being offered.

Mr. POLK. It is possible that they may, but as I tried to point out a minute ago the program that was carried out in 1951 was a program that the farmers worked out themselves. They picked out these practices which they wished to carry out on their farms. They wanted to do these certain things on their land. As a result of the farm committee program they picked out the items that I mention, the applying of lime, phosphate and potash and turning under green manure. Those are the major ones. They also had some of these other projects, especially waterways construction and diversion and spreader ditches, the construction of permanent open ditches, and so forth, but only a very small number of the farmers were able or willing, may I say, to engage in that type of practice. So I contend the present administration is forcing the farmers to take a program that they do not want.

Mr. COOLEY. May I suggest to the gentleman, I come from the State of North Carolina, a State that uses more commercial fertilizer than any other State in the Union. Naturally, North Carolina farmers know something about the value of using commercial fertilizer, whereas in other sections of the country fertilizer has not been used so extensively. I want to suggest that this re-liming program and the phosphate program have brought considerable criticism to the overall ACP program for the reason it has been felt that the farmer was imposing upon the Government because he was doing the same thing over and over each year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Chairman, may I say in answer to the gentleman from North Carolina that I have not heard the criticism he mentions from farmers in the State of Ohio. We have had much unanimity of opinion in approval of the program in Ohio. However, there is no doubt but what in some parts of the country it may not have worked satisfactorily.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. Of course, the farmers have used the practice over and over again, but they have not used it over and over again in the same field and the same spot. I think that is the thing which has created a lot of confusion. A lot of malicious gossip has been spread about a fact that these practices have been used over and over again by the farmer, giving the impression that he is putting that fertilizer on the fields over and over again, which he is not doing. He goes to his field, he puts lime on that field this year, he seeds it down to grass and legumes, then he moves over to another portion of that field or to another field the next year. I see nothing absolutely wrong with that practice.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to make it perfectly clear that I did not suggest that there had been any abuse, but I do suggest there has been a lot of criticism on the floor of the House. Whether that criticism was warranted or not, I do not know. It certainly has not been warranted so far as my own State is concerned.

Mr. POLK. I would like to say that the justification for the advanced authorizations for the 1954 agricultural conservation program by the last administration seem to me to point up this problem very well.

The budget estimates propose an authorization for the 1954 agricultural conservation program amounting to \$250 million, the same amount authorized by the Congress for the 1953 program.

May I say that at the proper time tomorrow I shall seek recognition to offer an amendment on page 31, line 14, to increase the amount of ACP authorization to \$250 million, the amount of money available this year. I would like to point out in that particular as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] said a little while ago, that is a ceiling; that does not mean that that much money will be spent unless the farmers ask for it, but it does mean that the money is available for them if they can work out a cooperative soil conservation program fitting into the Federal scheme. I certainly hope that the membership of this House will see fit to increase this appropriation to \$250 million, the amount that was available this year.

I would like in that connection to point out that the amounts appropriated for the agricultural conservation program for 5 of the last 6 years have averaged slightly more than \$264 million annually.

In 1947 the appropriation was \$300 million.

In 1948 it was reduced to \$150 million. In 1949 it was increased to \$262 million.

In 1950, to \$285 million.

In 1951 to \$225 million.

Last year we raised it to \$250 million.

I believe in the interest of a sound soil-conservation program throughout the Nation we should have at least the amount that was available this year.

For more than 100 years this Nation used up its land faster than any other nation in history. Nearly 50 million acres of land which once had been cultivated—more than 1 in every 11 acres of land once capable of growing crops—had become unsuitable for cultivation. Only about 100 million acres of land, representing about 10 percent of the land in the farms, was free from erosion. Attention became focused upon conservation as a national problem and definite steps were taken to provide for the preservation and conservation of the Nation's agricultural resources.

Under the agricultural conservation program and the soil- and water-conservation activities of local, State, and other Federal agencies, extensive progress has been made in reducing erosion and rebuilding soil fertility. However, the Nation is not yet close to balancing its conservation with needs. The Nation has become aware that the concept of inexhaustible resources is false and that the amount of land available for production is very definitely limited. Agricultural resources must be protected and fertility must be built up to safeguard the future ability of the Nation's farms to produce enough to meet the growing requirements of an increasing population.

Over the past 10 years the average increase in population has been more than

2 million persons a year. On the basis of maintaining the 1950 level of diet, farm production, by 1975, would have to be increased by at least 25 percent to meet the normal needs. Most of this increase must come from present acres of cropland and pasture by increasing yields per acre. To get the needed increase, present acres must be built up and losses of productive acres must be checked. Improved varieties of seed, more and better fertilizers, and mechanization will all help to increase yields, but, most important, the basic agricultural resources must be used according to their capabilities and treated according to their needs.

Financial assistance is especially important for the permanent type practices such as erosion control, drainage and forestry which require a substantial outlay of cash and which do not result in immediate cash returns. Although a farmer may recognize the need for carrying out this type of practice, he is influenced by the fact that his interest in the land is for a comparatively short period of time. The interest of the Nation, on the other hand, is for an indefinite period of time, since its strength and welfare depend upon the continued productivity of the soil and water resources.

Soil conservation practices carried out on Ohio farms under the agricultural conservation program in 1951

PRACTICES WHICH BENSON ADMINISTRATION HAS ELIMINATED FROM 1954 ACP

Practice	Farms on which carried out	Extent of practice		
		Acres	Units	
			Unit of quantity	Quantity
1. Applying liming material.....	58,950	947,651	Tons.....	1,188,184
2. Applying phosphate (20 percent P ₂ O ₅).....	51,710	738,020	do.....	80,603
3. Applying potash (50 percent K ₂ O).....	43,493	715,227	do.....	19,929
4. Turning under green manure crops.....	23,998	380,690		
5. Seeding increased acreage of legumes and grasses.....	3,643	35,010		
6. Contour farming intertilled crops.....	553	9,271		
7. Contour farming close sown crops.....	553	9,518		
8. Clearing land.....	605	4,122		
9. Mulching orchards, etc.....	1,052		Tons.....	8,767
10. Fencing for protection of woodland, etc.....	198		Rods.....	16,673

PRACTICES WHICH BENSON ADMINISTRATION HAS RETAINED IN 1954 ACP

1. Establishing sod waterways.....	1,780		Square feet.....	296,937
2. Constructing diversion and spreader ditches, dikes, and terraces.....	139		Rods.....	8,778
3. Constructing permanent open drainage ditches.....	593	13,177	Cubic yards.....	308,864
4. Installing enclosed drains (tile).....	8,931	172,502	Rods.....	1,718,889
5. Seeding pasture and rangeland.....	3,239	29,460		
6. Dams for livestock water.....	404	404	Cubic yards earth moved.....	489,000
7. Developing springs and seeps.....	42	42		
8. Tree planting.....	1,085	5,397		
9. Improving stand of forest trees.....	7	99		
10. Contour stripcropping.....	1,415	18,548		
11. Stripcropping not on contour.....	185	3,734		
12. Constructing terraces.....	61	1,137	Linear feet.....	176,000

¹ Drained.

² Structures.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time at the moment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, according to the statements made by the gentle-

man from Ohio [Mr. POLK] there seems to be some confusion about the duties and responsibilities of the present PMA county committees. I should like to read a statement by the Secretary of Agriculture in regard to the responsibilities and duties of the county committees in the agricultural-conservation program and the use he presently intends to make of them in his administration of the program. I quote the statement of Secre-

tary Benson, appearing in our hearings at page 901:

You may be assured that I am aware of the splendid contribution PMA county and community committees have made to agriculture and that we intend to make the best possible use of these farmer-elected committees in administering farm programs.

I have recently revised the regulations governing PMA county and community committees. In the revised regulations we made it abundantly clear that these committees will have local responsibility for the agricultural-conservation program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak about that branch of the soil conservation program that builds up the land by keeping the rain drops where they fall, which increases the fertility and productivity of the land.

In my State of Iowa each year many plowing contests or plowing matches are held. Some are county matches, some State matches. A number of times we have had the national plowing contests held in the State, where the national level-land-plowing champion was selected, as well as the national contour-plowing champion.

I should like to take you with me in your minds to a farm in Iowa where one of these plowing contests is held. In the first place, the committee in charge selects the farm and arranges with its owner for the use of it for 1 day. All the owner supplies is the use of the land and permission for the people to roam over it. He also furnishes some of the machinery necessary to do the work.

During that 1 day the entire face of the farm is lifted. As one of our best editors, Mr. Don Berry, of Indianola, Iowa, who has spent almost a lifetime in the study of soil conservation, told me a few years ago, when the face of a 120-acre farm is lifted in one day's time at one of these plowing contests it adds 40 acres in value to the farm, or 33 1/3 percent. I am sure that the future will bear out those figures.

Just what happens in one day of these contests? In the first place, the farmers are taught by demonstration how to plow around a hill, contour plowing. Do you realize that many of our best farmers have prided themselves for many years on their ability to plow a straight furrow, that if they start plowing around a hill or a slope they will end up going straight up and down it, and each furrow becomes a conduit to carry the soil down to the creeks, and then to the rivers, and then to the oceans? Therefore, they teach them to plow around by marking out with limestone markers lines around the hill. But first they show them the advisability of not plowing the top of a hill but leaving it to sod. About a third or half way down the hill they leave another strip of sod; and if it is a long slope, still another one before they get to the foot of a hill.

About every 10 rods in the plowed part they will throw 2 or 3 furrows together to make a breaker for the purpose of holding the water. The farmers see that. They learn the advantage of it. Next year they have the privilege of coming back and seeing the results

in increased productivity on those hills that have been put under the contour plan. Next, they fill up the gullies and the ditches and seed them over. Also, they fill them up in such a manner with straw and trees that they will not wash out again. Sometimes tubes are put in underneath to drain off the water. Then with bulldozers and shovels they dig out a pond or a place for a pond or a lake, and when that fills up the farmer stocks it with fish. In 2 years after one of those ponds has been stocked with the right kind of fish, they can get 1 1/2- and 2-pound crappies and bass in addition to holding all that water on the land and preventing it being washed into the streams and eventually into the ocean. Also at these plowing matches, the farmer is taught the use of fertilizers of all kinds, including limestone and how best to apply it to the soil. In addition, he is taught the value of the rotation of crops as well as many other things.

Mr. Chairman, in the time left to me I want to compare the value of that and what it does for the building up of our soil and preserving it with some of the things that have been proposed and are going on in certain parts of the land that take valuable soil out of production. I mean the building of dams in those parts of our country where dams are not necessary for reclamation purposes as they are in the Western States where they have deserts and they build a dam to provide water for irrigation purposes, which actually brings to the American people more land to produce more for their benefit. But to build a dam in the Mississippi Valley basin where irrigation is not necessary is only to take out of production and off of the tax rolls hundreds of thousands of acres of the most valuable land in the United States. I am not opposed to the building of dams for the prevention of floods and protection against floods, but I do say the building of dams without first doing everything we can to preserve the soil by keeping the raindrops where they fall is putting the cart before the horse. You know on the Mississippi River between Keokuk and St. Paul, there are more than 14 sets of dams and locks. They have been there for years.

A year ago last month in coming back to Washington from Iowa, I had to cross the Mississippi River. I could not cross at Davenport. I drove down to Muscatine and I got across, but 2 hours later on that day I would not have been able to cross there because of the floods. Do dams prevent the floods? No; they do not. Once the water gets off the soil into the stream and into the rivers, we have floods just the same. A few years ago I had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Public Works, and at one of its sessions one day, many of the Army engineers came up. I questioned one of them. Finally, he admitted that if every farm that drains into the Mississippi River or into the Missouri River was put under the soil-conservation program, as I have demonstrated here, and as it is demonstrated at the plowing contests, 50 percent of the water which now goes into the rivers would remain on the soil where the raindrops fall. My next question was how often then would we have

a devastating flood such as we had in 1947 if every farm were put under this plan? He said not more than once in every 75 years. First, we should do everything to build up and increase and even appropriate more money for the kind of soil conservation that increases the fertility of the soil and preserves it for the future, and also prevents the taking of valuable land out of production and putting it under water instead of taking it out from under water and putting it under production. In those States of our Nation where it is necessary to build the dams to get the water for irrigation purposes, let us build them—build for the future. I greatly appreciated the statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], when he said two things were necessary, namely, to preserve valuable soil that we have by building it up and also to reclaim the nonproductive soil we now have and make it productive.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if, in his opinion, this appropriation bill in any way decreases the amount of money appropriated for the building up of our soil such as is practiced at our plowing contests.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. My answer to the gentleman on that specific question would be that if this bill goes through, as proposed, we will have as good a program for the preservation of our soil as it is possible to get through the Congress today.

In addition, I might state to the gentleman that the pilot-plant operation we have proposed in this bill for the upper watersheds is a distinct step forward, and along the line that the gentleman advocates.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Do I understand from the gentleman's statement, for which I thank him, that this upper watershed proposal in this bill, for which there is \$5 million set aside, will tend to keep the water in the tributaries and streams up on the farms, and keep it from going down to the rivers where it washes the soil away?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We hope that the suggested pilot-plant program will prove the advisability of doing just what you propose.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman, and I congratulate him, as well as the members of his committee, for bringing out this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to congratulate the gentleman from the State of Iowa for the fine speech he has just made, explaining how the plowing contest was carried on, and in helping the farmers learn and see what value there is in contouring and all the practices which the Soil Conservation Service recommends. The gentleman has made a very fine presentation. Of course, we in Iowa are

very proud of the fact that the farmers in Iowa have done a wonderful job in the preservation of the soil, but still there is a great deal to be done.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I wish to thank my colleague from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], who has taken a great interest in the preservation of our valuable soil at home, and emphasizes the old saying, "There is no substitute for knowledge." The demonstrations put on at these plowing contests give knowledge to the farmer that he needs to preserve his own soil.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I am wondering why there seems to be so much difference between the statement of the Army engineers with regard to what effect upstream soil conservation practices have with regard to flood prevention. I believe you say they told you it might result in a 50-percent increase.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes. That was the testimony of the witness before the Public Works Committee several years ago when I personally interrogated him. It was like pulling teeth to get him to admit it because he was favoring the building of dams for power purposes more than for flood control. But after some discussion he did finally admit to me that if every farm in the Mississippi Valley Basin was put under the soil-conservation contour system, as is provided by Congress—an educational program—that 50 percent of the water that is going into the streams will be held on the land where the raindrops fall. My next question after that was if we did that how often would we have a devastating flood like we had in 1947, and he said not more than once in 75 years. I do not see any conflict in his testimony at all. It was a question of building up the land and then, after that is accomplished, building what dams are necessary. If the soil is not built up and is permitted to wash into the streams, it is gone just as much as if it was washed into the Gulf of Mexico. The thing to do is do the first thing first and the next thing next.

Mr. WHITTEN. I join in the statement made by my colleagues on that side of the aisle. Friends of America and American agriculture know no dividing line when it comes to soil conservation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do want to say that I want it clearly understood that what is in this bill on flood prevention does not attempt to resolve this major difference that exists between the Soil Conservation Service and the Corps of Engineers and between the Agriculture Committee and the Committee on Public Works. I have my own views about that, but this is merely an effort to use the authority of the Department to do a very necessary work on a pilot-scale basis and thereby prove the value of this approach to it. I want it understood because we do not want to lose a very major effort, as I see it, which has great potentialities for the future benefit of the country. Let us hope it is understood because it might be taken that we were trying through this means to re-

solve a difficulty that we all know does exist.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman, and my position is exactly the same as his. I am not against the building of dams to prevent floods and devastation to save our people, but I do say that the most important thing is to keep the raindrops where they fall; then we will know better what can be accomplished.

Mr. WHITTEN. I did not mean to get the gentleman into that side of the question, but we do not want to lose this effort here because someone might misunderstand and think that in trying to deal with this question we are trying to settle something else.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. No; we do not want to lose sight of the value of limestone. It is very valuable.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I speak about this bill as a farmer, and I would like to state in a few words, in the short time I have, what I think the basic farmer-interest is in this matter.

In my honest opinion the reason that the farmers have been comparatively poor in our economy over all these years is that the farmers, by reason of overproduction, have necessarily had a poor bargaining position in a free economy. In this country agriculture is rapidly approaching the stage where it is outside of a free economy. A great many people are free enterprisers until it comes to farming, and then they think the Government should take a hand and furnish aid from tax money to promote production, when as a matter of fact the farmer is looking forward to that day when profits will be the incentive for production. He will always produce just as much with that incentive as this country can possibly eat.

We have learned from the previous speakers about the great hunger of the world and the impending growth of our own population requiring millions of extra acres, yet there are thousands of farmers back in the country hoping for the quick arrival of the day when demand will equal the supply they produce.

We certainly must recognize today that we have overproduction; in fact, this country is almost choking with food, and the Government does not know what to do with all it holds, all of which hangs over the free market like a weight waiting to cut off the head of any speculator who might offer a little more money for it.

This program of the Government encouraging overpromotion of agriculture has gone on in this country for 50 to 75 years on a nonpartisan basis, all because this Government, mainly here in Washington, felt that it was either good policy or good politics to give the farmer more and more. Today we are discussing an appropriation bill which gives him in an item or two more than he wants, more than he is entitled to in the interest of the consumers, the taxpayers, or even himself, and I think I can speak in behalf of a host of farmers who by their own ingenuity and hard

work have established themselves as efficient operators in the production of food.

The whole theory of the Government has been one of protective charity but actually the result has been overproduction, so that the market prices never seem to quite cover the farmers' expenses without all of this Government aid. The sooner the population increases in this country so that supplies are a little short, the better it will be for the farmer because then he will be in a position where he can get higher prices.

I believe in real conservation. We have a longtime interest in the future, and, as I said, I believe in real conservation, but there is a lot in this so-called conservation program that is phony when it comes to real conservation. First you must remember that nothing uses up our soil reserves quite so fast as use in the growing of crops. Less use in crop production is real conservation. Then on top of that, the Government supplies free chemicals to put into the soil for growing more and more crops. Some of these practices are perhaps in the interest of the longtime future, but a great many of them are strictly in the interest of current year's operation.

We find the Government spending some \$69 million for lime and other materials. Incidentally, I think as a farm operator I use perhaps more lime than any other individual farm operator in the East. The Government has helped me to pay for a lot of it in the past. When it is applied to annual practices it is an absolute travesty upon justice, an absolute detriment to the farmer in the long run in that it pays him a part of current operating expenses and thereby increases the surplus. There is no more reason for doing that than to pay the rent for the corner grocery storekeeper.

Mr. Benson came to this committee and said he could get along with \$140 million instead of \$195 million, which was projected for 1954. Of course, he can. It will be very easy because in 1953 we propose to spend \$82 million for lime, phosphate, and other minerals, whereas he proposes only \$24 million, a reduction reasonably accomplished by simply stopping the free gift of materials which contribute nothing to conservation.

Where does he get it? Nineteen million dollars is currently being supplied to farmers for the growing of cover crops on an annual basis. I plant a lot of rye in the winter-time and cover crops in the summer, all using lime, then I plow them down and use the humus in the production of other crops. That just becomes a current part of my operation. Nineteen million dollars is being given away this year just for lime and fertilizers for green manure and annual cover crops. Eleven million dollars more is being given away strictly for pastures.

What are pastures? Pastures are not necessarily soil conservation. It depends on how they are grazed. Certainly the purpose of fertilizing and liming pastures is mainly for the production of food for beef.

In my estimation, the whole reduction of \$55 million could be made by stopping these heavy payments for practices

which have no real relation to permanent conservation.

I want to point out a few other ridiculous practices that exist over the country. There is the protecting of summer fallow, which takes \$5 million. Summer fallow, as you know, is that practice which denudes the land of all its summertime growth and holds it so that it will catch more rain so as to build up the soil moisture and improve the later crop. But, under summer fallowing land is fully exposed to erosion, so they list furrows in it at Government expense.

Subsoiling, that means digging the soil deep, \$1,200,000.

Deep plowing sandy soil, \$900,000. There is not one of those practices which is in line with soil conservation.

Estimated portion of reseeding pastures that have previously been seeded, \$16 million.

Fencing to protect wood lots, \$1 million.

Building stock trails, \$61,000.

Weed control by tillage, \$1 million.

Weed control by chemicals, \$1 million.

Seeding hay crops, \$500,000.

We pay one farmer under this program for clearing land for putting in crops; then we pay another farmer for reforestation. Clearing land is not conservation. In fact, the best way to save our land for the next generation is stop farming it until it is needed. There is nothing better than weeds and natural cover to conserve the land.

Overproduction is the worst form of waste of soil resources.

This agriculture conservation program could be logically cut by 100 million. Surely we can get along on the 140 million asked by the Department.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle for the fine work they have done in providing us with this, shall I say, straightforward and forthright approach to the problems of agriculture. I have always felt that this committee is more than a committee on appropriations, because in many ways it lays the groundwork for the agricultural programs that will be really and truly promoted to help the farmers in the coming year.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to use the remaining portion of my time to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business I wish to discuss this afternoon the tragic and desperate plight now presently existing in the mining industry, and I especially wish to direct attention to the conditions that now exist in the lead and zinc operations. Our committee held hearings in four different localities in the West, where more than 60 percent of the lead and zinc mine operators are engaged in producing these ores. There were many mine operators representing small, middle-sized, and large operations who appeared be-

fore our committee. And in these hearings we covered the mining areas in the States of Colorado, California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Utah, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Arizona, and the tri-State district of Oklahoma, Kansas, and Missouri.

The tragic story of the destruction of our metal mines was told by these lead and zinc producers, and I repeat again the small producers, the large producers, and the miners themselves fresh from the work stoops, labor-union representatives, and mine owners employing 10 to 30 men and up to as many as 600. We collected the opinions and the suggestions of a cross section of the mineral producers of the entire West.

Top executives of large mining organizations—union executives—appeared before us and told us that something had to be done if production was to continue. Chamber of commerce representatives and industrial leaders came before us and added their advice and suggestions.

Mr. Chairman, I shall include in my remarks excerpts from the testimony taken from these hearings and I know it will shock the Members of this House to learn of the tragic plight and the certain destruction of our lead-zinc domestic mining industry. Small-business operators, every one of them, now are standing on the very brink of total eclipse. Mr. Chairman, I became firmly convinced after hearing the statements of these actual miners and operators that only through quick and affirmative action by this Congress passing legislation, such as proposed by the sections 324, 325, and 326 of the Simpson bill, can we in my opinion save the lead and zinc industry. Otherwise, it will be eliminated from our economy.

Mr. Chairman, this is no time for political quibbling or political wrestling for advantage. No, I am certain we should lay aside every political aspect or approach to this question and approach it through and on a nonpartisan basis, and pass whatever legislation which in our judgment and our considered opinion seems necessary to stem this certain movement toward the crisis and the end of the domestic mining industry.

What if this legislation now before us does not immediately solve all our troubles? It does make an attempt in the right direction and should prevent the complete closing down of the lead and zinc industry. We may be able later to propose and pass legislation more to our liking than the particular bill we are now considering, but in my own mind I am certain we cannot delay longer. Action on the sections of the Simpson bill proposing a sliding scale tax on imported lead and zinc up to and including a price of 15½ cents per pound should be enacted into law with the greatest dispatch possible.

Let me quote from the testimony given by Robert S. Palmer, of Denver, Colo., executive vice president of the Colorado Mining Association at the Denver hearings. Mr. Palmer had this to say about the Simpson bill, and I quote:

The Simpson bill is designed in substance to save the industry from destruction in providing for a sliding-scale stabilization import tax on lead and zinc. It proposes to

maintain the American standard of living within the mining regions of the Nation. A base price on lead and zinc upon which the tax is to be determined is fixed at 15½ cents, adjusted periodically by the Bureau of Labor Statistics index on primary market prices for other than farm and food. It amounts to 1 cent plus 1 cent per pound for each 1 cent the market price is below the base price. For ores and concentrates imported into the country the tax would apply in a similar manner but in an amount of seven-tenths of a cent per pound for lead content and six-tenths of a cent for zinc content.

Continuing to quote Mr. Palmer:

The preservation of our domestic mining industry is purely that of self-interest. It involves the economy of our people here in the West, and in the various mining regions of the Nation. Mining is a basic industry. The operators of mines produce new wealth. They maintain the economies of many sections of the Nation. The railroads, the trucking lines, the power companies, and other utilities depend largely upon the mining industry for revenue. The retail merchants, the farmers, the ranchers, and all those who supply the miners, including the manufacturers, are affected when mines go down. Professional men, schoolteachers, and others all have a genuine interest in the welfare of the mining industry. It therefore seems proper that those who represent the mining industry should present a case to the Small Business Committee purely on the basis of self-interest.

The idea that a mine can be reopened overnight is absolutely beyond the realm of reason. There are those who have been proposing that we store our minerals in the ground, or just leave them where they are so we can get them immediately if needed. But this is impractical, for in the first place it is a well-known fact that in a great many areas underground pressure and movement takes place which destroys the tunnels, the shafts, and the working places. It would be very expensive to maintain the runways keep the machinery in shape, and underground waterflows would have to be kept pumped out and away from the machinery. Flooding and caving would take place and this would involve tremendous, continuous expenses.

An active, healthy, going mining industry is the best conservation of American mineral resources. This provides for the recovery—yes—a more efficient recovery of the natural resources of our country. It prevents losses of the reserves which otherwise would occur, and makes them available for quick usage when they are stockpiled on the surface, usage which can be taken advantage of if America should be attacked or war should threaten. This is a sensible and a sane approach to this question and I am sure is worth more than any theory that can be developed about what we should do with our natural resources.

Is it wise to place the safety and security of our Nation on the mere possibility of acquiring strategic minerals from foreign nations? No, my friends, there is a first-class hazard involved here. This is a chance, in my opinion, which we cannot afford to take. We should not jeopardize the safety and security of our Nation by relying on the possibility of securing strategic materials when war begins. Recently the Bolivian Government was overthrown and the tin mines were seized. Now that could happen to any

foreign country where we might be procuring lead or zinc, and within a few days we might find it impossible to obtain any ore. In addition, the fact remains that in a real hot war submarines would undoubtedly sink any ships that tried to bring ore across the ocean. And further, with airplanes as thick as they would be, it would not be safe to try to transport ore from one nation to another, or even the metal itself in a refined form. No, my friends, we just dare not place our whole country in jeopardy by depending on foreign sources for strategic minerals.

To give you an illustration of what has been going on in New Mexico, the testimony showed that in one small community 1,200 men were employed in 1952 and by the first of May in 1943 only 300 men were employed in mining. Mining payrolls have been reduced in the first 4 months of 1953 by at least 25 percent. In normal times the western part of the United States produces two-thirds of all the zinc and lead used in our country. From December 1951 to October 1952 the imports of lead and zinc increased 70 percent. You can understand what I am talking about when I tell you that the small-mine operators of the West are certain that imports are causing the decline in lead and zinc prices.

And from other testimony given to our committee I learned that if present conditions force the closing of the major portion of the domestic lead-zinc mines, then it is but logical to assume that the smelters and refiners will also be forced to close.

With the smelters and the refineries closed, the miners will be unable to sell the ore, to market the ore in its proper form. Consequently every mine will be shut down, and along with them many of the mills which have been milling the ore for small independent mines. With the larger mills closing down there is no possibility of the small miners being able to continue operation.

Foreign producing nations do not have the smelting and refining capacity to treat the additional ores that would be necessary if our zinc and lead mines were closed. They may have the facilities to smelt and refine the production that they have now for their own markets at home, but with the great increase in the ore that we would need they would not have the mill nor the smelter capacity to handle it. This means that we, the American taxpayers, would be paying, after our mines were closed down, much higher prices for our lead and zinc to enable foreign producers to expand their operations and build extensions to their plants to supply the necessary metals for our requirements. Again I say that this would bring about a most disastrous condition which would jeopardize our very life should war arise.

Mr. Chairman, another interesting matter was brought to our attention and that was the wages which are paid to the men who are mining in foreign countries. We were told by competent authorities that the quantity of ore mined per man in many of these countries is just about as high per man per hour or per day as it is in this country,

especially if the mine is properly equipped.

Here are some of the daily wages: In this country, for example, Utah pays an average wage of \$15.92 per day. The testimony showed that the average for the United States was from \$12 to \$15 per day.

Canada also pays high wages of from \$12 to \$15 per day. Other countries: Morocco pays \$1.50 per day; Peru, \$0.50 to \$2 per day; Guatemala, \$1.50 per day; Germany, \$1.35 per day.

I shall include in the RECORD the United States mine production on lead and zinc imports from 1930 until 1952. Let me just give you a few of the figures and then place the charts in the RECORD. In 1939 the average price of lead was 5.05 cents. That is the price per pound. The United States mine production was 414,000 short tons. The imports were 86,800 short tons. The production percentage of imports was 21 percent, and dropped in 1933 to 2.8 percent of our average domestic consumption. By 1940, and during the war, the imports increased. We find that in 1952 lead had reached a price of 16.47 cents per pound. That is the average domestic price. And we produced in the United States 375,000 short tons. But the imports were 637,000 short tons or 169 percent of our domestic production. In 1949, domestic production and foreign imports balanced. Zinc production paralleled that of lead. In 1939, zinc was worth 5.11 cents and we mined 583,000 short tons, but we imported 67,000, or about 11½ percent of our consumption. The price of lead was 8½ cents per pound. We produced 614,000 short tons, and imported 479,000, or 77.94 percent. Then in 1952 the imports of lead were 85 percent or only 15 percent less than our total domestic production.

If you study these tables you will realize what we mean when we say that something must be done to prevent the dumping of lead and zinc on our domestic market when prices are favorable.

This is the first time in the history of the lead and zinc industry that both the large and small producers of lead and zinc have unanimously agreed on legislation they think should be passed to save the industry from ruin.

Let me quote again from testimony given to our committee by the manager of a lead-producing firm in the State of Utah, he said:

During a few months of 1952 the price of lead and zinc fell 33 percent, which means over a 60 percent drop in our net returns. We are told that this enormous drop was brought about in this way. We gave England millions of dollars in order to help her economy; we gave other foreign countries many millions in order to help develop their mines through direct grants and long-term loans. England buys lead and zinc for her stockpile until she has a huge supply on hand. Then suddenly England needs dollars so she sells her lead-zinc stockpile to us which knocks the bottom out of prices. We really got this metal cheap. We paid to have it produced, we gave England money to buy it, and then we bought it back from England. We paid for it three times.

At the present time zinc is quoted at 11 cents per pound. It costs us 8 cents per pound to market zinc which leaves 3 cents

per pound to pay for the mining and milling costs of zinc ore. For example if crude ore runs 10 cents per 10 percent zinc you would have 200 pounds of zinc in a ton of ore. Milling will lose 20 pounds of this so that a ton of this ore is worth \$5.40 after it is mined and milled. It costs around \$6 a ton to mill this ore and \$10 per ton to mine it. In other words, we would lose money on this ore if it were already mined and all we had to do was to mill it.

And so the testimony goes, Mr. Chairman. The meeting at Spokane, Wash., followed the same pattern as the other meetings. Testimony in Spokane showed that our Nation consumes about half the world's lead supply, but our production is only one-third of that requirement. The balance of the need must be supplied from scrap and foreign imports.

Our country consumes 45 percent of the world's supply of zinc and produces two-thirds of our consumption. This testimony was given to us by Henry L. Day, of the Idaho Mining Association.

I think the testimony given by the representatives from the Coeur d'Alene district of northern Idaho was the most striking and impressive of any testimony we received. From this section of the country we received a petition signed by more than 5,000. Employment in this area declined by 600 men in the past 6 months. This was directly attributable to falling lead and zinc prices. In the case of his own company, the Day Mines Co., he said their organization was typical of what was going on in small and medium sized operations. He stated that lead output was the best it had been in recent years. His employment has varied in the last 10 or 12 years from 400 to 600. Today, his testimony showed, he was employing about 270 men and had difficulty preserving even that many men's positions in the company. Since last fall his lead output is off one-tenth and the zinc output is down one-half.

I would like to quote directly from the testimony given by one of the Idaho mine witnesses:

How many are aware that the Federal Government during World War II was forced to furlough nearly 10,000 soldiers to the nonferrous metal mines? Yet this was the case. The importance of operating mines, large and small, even on a part-time basis, cannot be overestimated. The great majority of local mines must operate continuously or not at all. They are not like a water faucet, to be turned off or on at will. Mines must be maintained continuously, as they cannot be placed in mothballs like a battleship for use in an emergency. Trained workers, or more exactly, an experienced nucleus, must be available in time of national emergency even to expand the output of known ore bodies.

Mr. Chairman, this is real testimony. This is information directly from men who are in the front lines who know what the mining industry is suffering. They know how it operates and they know what the effects are going to be if we allow this industry to pass out of our economic picture, which personally I am convinced is going to happen unless this Congress takes immediate and direct action on this problem.

The chief sources from where our lead and zinc are being imported are: Australia, Bolivia, Peru, Spain, Yugoslavia,

Union of South Africa, Mexico, and Canada.

Each country importing lead and zinc may require a special kind of reciprocal-trade agreement. Time and great care should be used in arriving at a plan suitable and acceptable to the various countries. But while this attempt is being made we should pass the Simpson bill to stem this tide of certain destruction of our lead and zinc production.

Let me give you testimony from a witness to show you some of the foolish contracts we have entered into in the last few years. I read from a witness' testimony at Spokane:

Defense Materials Procurement Agency has contracted for lead from Guatemala over a 7½-year period at prices from 17 to 20 cents.

Mark you, I am reading from the record.

They contracted for zinc from Mexico and Peru over a 5-year period for a price of 16½ cents up to 17½ cents.

This same witness continued:

Canada favors its mining economy with a very attractive tax structure and prudent climate for investors in mining adventures.

I frankly confess that as far as I am concerned I have always felt that our mining industry has been neglected by those who were trying to develop great industries in other countries.

From Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma we had the same testimony. It followed the same line as the testimony we received from other sections, including: Idaho, California, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to place in the RECORD, as part of my address, excerpts from a paper prepared for me by the Library of Congress on the economic problems confronting small mines, and I would like to call to your attention some tables, or charts, in this report:

Over the last few years, an increased number of electrolytic zinc refineries and improvements in metallurgy have brought zinc more and more into the position of an important source of income for small mines. In fact, many small mines, formerly abandoned, can, under a stable and modern price for zinc, be rehabilitated as zinc-silver mines long after they have lost their value as lead-silver mines. But even with these effectively cared for, the miners are still confronted with technical problems of great difficulty since the amount of zinc must be several percent higher in an ore than would make it economical to handle as a lead ore.

The lead-zinc-silver ores, because of their generally small volume and widely variable richness are usually outside the category of big business.

Provisions have been made in the Federal program for gathering of statistics on mineral production, monthly prices, imports, stocks of metals on hand, and other data which are all assembled and reported by the Statistics and Economics Branch of the United States Bureau of Mine, the official data-gathering agency in the mineral field for the Federal Government. Such data assembled by the Bureau of Mines are generally accepted by the industry and Government agencies as being reliable.

From the point of view of the small-mine operator, these data are only the beginning point for the type of complicated analysis and appraisal he would like to have to explain what is affecting the prices and supplies of

the metals he produces and all the various forces affecting his operations. Appropriate policies and programs to remedy difficulties should be founded on facts and thorough studies but these are not made.

No agency in the Federal Government has been designated as being responsible for taking these basic statistical data collected by the Bureau of Mines and making economic studies and interpretations in understandable terms that would be available to the small-mine operator. A clear-cut explanation of the various economic and other forces affecting their industry would be generally acceptable.

Maximum benefit that can be gained by the most favorable outcome of action under the escape clause

	Present duty	Maximum possible—New duty	Gain over existing duty
	<i>Cents</i>		
Lead ores, etc.	0.75 (¾)	1.8	1.05
Lead bullion, etc.	1.0625 (1⅛)	2.55	1.4875
Zinc ores, etc.	0.6 (⅝)	1.8	1.2
Zinc slabs, stocks, etc.	0.7 (⅞)	2.1	1.4

Zinc: United States mine production and imports

[In short tons]

Year	Average domestic price	United States mine production	Total imports	Imports in percent of production
	<i>Cents per pound</i>			
Section 1:				
1930	4.56	595,425	2,612	0.44
1931	3.64	410,318	1,054	.26
1932	2.88	285,231	2,214	.78
1933	4.03	384,280	3,979	1.04
1934	4.16	438,726	16,002	3.65
1935	4.33	517,903	14,964	2.89
1936	4.90	575,574	11,832	2.03
1937	6.52	626,362	46,020	7.35
1938	4.61	516,703	25,813	5.00
1939	5.11	583,807	66,998	11.48
Section 2:				
1940	6.34	665,068	196,788	29.59
1941	7.47	749,125	194,808	26.00
1942	8.25	768,025	319,519	41.60
1943	8.25	744,196	570,726	76.69
1944	8.25	718,642	486,325	67.67
1945	8.25	614,358	478,835	77.94
Section 3:				
1946	8.73	574,833	376,809	65.55
1947	10.50	637,608	370,271	58.07
1948	13.59	629,977	357,501	56.75
1949	12.14	593,203	367,803	62.01
Section 4:				
1950	13.87	623,375	427,881	68.64
1951	18.00	672,520	390,449	58.06
1952	16.22	661,023	565,029	85.48

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Mines and American Bureau of Metal Statistics.

Lead: United States mine production and imports

[In short tons]

Year	Average domestic price	United States mine production	Total imports	Imports in percent of production
	<i>Cents per pound</i>			
Sec. 1:				
1930	5.52	558,300	78,200	14.0
1931	4.24	404,600	53,200	13.1
1932	3.18	293,000	34,500	11.8
1933	3.87	272,700	7,700	2.8
1934	3.86	287,300	13,300	4.6
1935	4.06	331,100	24,000	7.2
1936	4.71	372,900	23,600	6.3
1937	6.01	464,900	40,900	8.8
1938	4.74	369,700	63,900	17.3
1939	5.05	414,000	86,800	21.0
Sec. 2:				
1940	5.18	457,400	282,500	61.8
1941	5.79	461,400	381,200	82.6
1942	6.48	496,200	492,500	99.3
1943	6.50	453,300	319,100	70.4
1944	6.50	416,900	319,700	76.7
1945	6.50	390,800	300,300	76.8
Sec. 3:				
1946	8.11	335,500	159,300	47.5
1947	14.67	384,200	227,800	59.3
1948	18.04	386,900	347,100	89.7
1949	15.36	404,000	399,500	98.9
Sec. 4:				
1950	13.30	430,800	541,900	123.7
1951	17.49	390,400	257,900	65.5
1952	16.47	375,000	637,000	169.9

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. WHITTEN. We have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read down to and including line 6, page 1, of the bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McCULLOCH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State

of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AMENDING RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] be given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House resolution which would amend the rules of the House, so that three members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—to be appointed by the Speaker—would sit as ex officio members of the House Committee on Appropriations at times when atomic energy appropriation bills are under consideration.

If this resolution is adopted, it will make the practice in the House conform with the practice in the Senate. A little more than 2 years ago the rules of the Senate were altered so as to permit 3 members from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to sit as ex officio members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations when atomic energy matters are being considered.

I suggest to the House that this Senate practice is sound and responsible and that it contributes to wise decisions—since atomic energy matters are so complex that joint committee members, who alone have the opportunity of studying such matters the year around, are able to bring added perspective as a supplement to the able judgments of the Appropriations Committee members.

There is another unusual factor here which I should like to stress. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy does not have what might be called authorizing jurisdiction. In other words, the joint committee does not under present law have the duty and the authority to report out enabling legislation for each major new atomic project which is to be undertaken.

I stress this point because the Armed Services Committees do have such authority in their field. They do have the duty and the authority to report out enabling legislation for each new military project. Thus, the position of the joint committee in this respect differs markedly from the position of the Armed Services Committees.

Accordingly, on April 15, 1953, I wrote the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, in part, as follows:

It was the thought of my colleagues on the House side [of the joint committee] that you might see fit to arrange informally for three of us to sit with your committee and Mr. PHILLIPS' subcommittee when atomic energy appropriations are up for discussion.

Since the joint committee does not report out enabling legislation for the various new

atomic projects as to which funds are requested, the members have long questioned whether our contact with the fiscal side of the atomic program is now as close as our responsibilities require. An arrangement such as the one I have described might go far in remedying this situation.

However, other standing committees of the House, of course, do normally report out enabling legislation to authorize new programs before the necessary appropriation requests come before your committee. Hence, an invitation to have joint committee members join in your deliberations would not set a precedent which other committees might seek to follow.

On April 21 the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee replied to my letter, saying that he could not extend to joint committee members an invitation to sit in and indicating that, if such an invitation were to be extended, it would set a precedent for other committees. However, as I emphasized, this is not the case—since the joint committee is unique in its lack of authority to report out enabling bills, and hence unique in its need to sit in on appropriation hearings.

For these reasons, I very much hope that the House may see fit to adopt the resolution which I am today introducing. Such approval will, I think, avoid the setting of a precedent and at the same time assist the work of the House.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, because of the lateness of the hour, I will not use the special ordered granted me for this evening but I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, as well as on the following day, after the disposition of all legislative matters on the Speaker's desk, I may address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

OUR ECONOMY AS STRONG AS A PUPPY?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

OUR ECONOMY AS STRONG AS A PUPPY?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. W. Randolph Burgess, Treasury deputy in charge of debt management, has placed a very low evaluation on the strength

of our national economy. He told the New Jersey bankers, May 8:

The economy is as strong as a bull pup.

It would be more reassuring, if he is compelled to compare our national economy to an animal, if he would at least refer to it as "bull strong" or as "strong as an elephant." Dr. Burgess is a great economist. Possibly he believes other economists understand that kind of a comparison better. I would not know. I do have a very high regard for our economists, both in and out of Government service.

The truth is, the economy at the time Dr. Burgess came in was stronger than it has ever been before, but by reason of Dr. Burgess' activities our economy has become weakened—not so much weakened that it cannot be restored—but something must be done soon in that direction or we are headed for serious trouble.

Dr. Burgess has been the outstanding spearhead for the eastern bankers for a number of years in the drive for high interest rates. It is unfortunate that the administration has selected such a biased, partisan, selfishly interested person to have charge of debt management.

If the hard-money, high-interest policy is not changed, much of the expansion program that has been projected for the last half of 1953 will not materialize. Every day mention is made in the press about different concerns taking another look at the cost increase that is being caused by high interest and tight money.

Dr. Burgess is making an unfair illustration concerning my own views about money, inflation, and high interest.

I do not believe any Member of Congress has a better record in support of anti-inflationary measures—including the very unpopular price and wage controls and tax measures—than I have. Yet, because I agreed that higher interest would be preferable to ruinous inflation, Dr. Burgess seizes upon that as a commitment from me that I favor the present high-interest, tight-money policy. I would only favor higher interest to prevent inflation as the very last resort if it would be effective for that purpose. Several effective weapons can be used before we reach that point. One is the reserve requirements of banks—the ones doing the most business—can still be raised. It would be interesting to know the excuse the Board gives for not increasing these reserves on the big city banks—New York and Chicago—where the law allows it. The Board increased the reserve requirements on the country banks to 100 percent of the amount allowed but not on these big city banks where a very high percentage of the inflation is caused. There are other ways but this one should come first. Furthermore, I am not convinced that higher interest is not itself inflationary, which should be determined before using it as a proposed remedy for inflation.

I am not sure that the threat of inflation is sufficient now to use any one of the many methods that could be used that are anti-inflationary. In fact, the Federal Reserve Board must believe that we went over the hump of inflation a

couple of months ago or the Board would not have reduced the margin requirements on stock exchange transactions. By doing this, it is great encouragement to speculation, which no one will contend is anything except inflationary and causes more bank-created money which the Board claims to be against.

HIGH INTEREST—TIGHT MONEY—CITY BURDENS

In the Washington Herald, May 17, 1953, there is an interesting article by Walter S. J. Swanson about the plight of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission. He discloses the information that on the \$4,700,000 bond issue, which is to be sold May 28, there will be an interest charge of 3½ percent, which is considerably higher than the sanitary district has been compelled to pay in the past. This will, of course, increase sewer and water bills.

There are a lot of people in that particular district, who enjoy high salaries and large personal incomes. These 3½ percent bonds are tax exempt, as all State, county, city, and political subdivision bonds are. A person in the \$20,000-a-year income bracket, who purchases a 3½-percent tax-exempt bond has what is equivalent to an 8½-percent rate as compared with securities and stocks that are not tax exempt. As Mr. Swanson brings out, a person with an \$80,000-a-year income—and there are certainly a lot of them in that area—the yield from these bonds would be equivalent to a 23.33-percent yield from something else. It can also be pointed out that the return for one in the \$100,000-a-year income bracket would be the equivalent of 35 percent.

This same thing is going on all over the country. As interest rates increase, all utilities—gas, water, telephone, electricity, buses, and railroads—are compelled to pay more interest. This compels the utilities to ask for and get higher rates, which falls right back on the consumer. In addition to that, all public improvement bonds of cities, counties, and States must carry a much higher rate of interest because of the administration's hard money, high interest rate of money policy, and that falls right back on the taxpayer, who must pay higher taxes to pay higher interest. The farmers and wage earners are particularly hard hit on higher interest rates.

ACTION BY EXECUTIVE NEEDED NOW

It should be recalled that this policy started under Chairman McCabe, of the Federal Reserve Board, who seemed to be more persuaded by the arguments of his reactionary, eastern-banker, Republican friends, than his consideration for the public good. The policy had not gone so far when the new administration came in that it could not have been stopped in its tracks without causing the chain reactions that are now setting in, but instead of the policy being stopped, it seems to have received encouragement and support.

It is my sincere hope that President Eisenhower will take this matter in hand and do something about it. It is too serious to go unnoticed by the Executive. It is giving our entire economy a devastating shake, and if something is not

done soon will probably cause a serious depression.

"THE LID IS ON"

Sylvia F. Porter, often referred to as one of America's most outstanding financial experts, had an article in her column that appeared in the papers May 13, 1953, on the subject of The Lid Is On. It has been called to my attention by the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, who is also very much concerned about the administration's high-interest, tight-money policy and who made a good speech on this subject February 5, 1951, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 1, page 1010.

It is as follows:

THE LID IS ON (By Sylvia F. Porter)

In March 1951, the great inflation that had cursed America for a full decade came to a perceptible halt.

Since then—right into today—you and I have enjoyed virtually the economic ideal of roaring production, full employment, record paychecks and relatively stable prices.

In March 1951, the bitter fiscal-monetary policy battle between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board ended in a smashing victory for the Federal Reserve and its anti-inflation plans.

Since then—right into today—as a result of deliberate Federal Reserve policy, interest rates have surged to the stiffest levels in 20 years, the cost of borrowing money has climbed to the highest point since the panic year of 1933, all bond prices have crashed and United States Government bonds have slumped to historic lows.

Is there a connection between the two events of March 1951—the definite interruption in the inflation spiral and the Federal Reserve's start of a determined effort to clamp down on the supply of money and put the lid on credit?

Of course there's a connection although other factors also have played a part in bringing inflation under control.

But now it's May 1953. Now the Reserve's money squeeze is really beginning to hurt all owners of bonds, all borrowers of money.

So now the lines are forming for the first major policy fight of the Eisenhower administration—a fight over whether the Reserve is not moving so far and so fast that it is undermining our strength and sending us straight for a deflation.

Take your seats at the arena, Mr. and Mrs. America. This one will be a honey and already is transcending all party lines.

Here is what has happened since the Federal Reserve withdrew its support from the United States bond market, stopped creating new money and let interest rates and bond prices respond to demand-supply laws.

The United States bond market has had the worst collapse in decades. Billions of dollars in values have been wiped out. Every bank, savings institution, insurance company has terrific losses on its books. If some smaller institutions had to liquidate tomorrow, they'd be in a bad, if not intolerable, spot.

Borrowing money is more expensive and tougher than at any time since the depression 1930's.

The Treasury itself is having a hard time borrowing money and is paying twice, three times the rate of interest it paid only a short while ago. Business borrowers—from the top down—farmers, veterans, home buyers, builders are in a similar pinch.

The Wall Street bond and money markets are shaking with fear.

I hear that the Reserve and Treasury are being deluged with letters and calls from

smaller bankers through the country who have been locked in by the bond price break and who are getting scared.

Elliott Bell, a top Republican spokesman and publisher of Business Week, a couple of days ago wrote a major editorial in this conservative magazine calling for an easing of the Reserve policy and declaring we are glad to know the brakes work but we don't want to go through the windshield.

On Monday a group of 20 Democratic Congressmen submitted a resolution also demanding that the Reserve let up on its rapid and reckless credit-tightening program.

So far the Reserve is standing firm. It says it won't ease up until signs of deflation appear and it doesn't yet see the signs. So far, despite the spot it's in, the Treasury is backing the Reserve.

It'll be a long, fierce fight climaxing when deflation hits. In preparation, the Reserve had better buy some storm windows for its beautiful building in Washington. It'll sure need them.

February 21, 1953, I gave out the following statement concerning the Board's action in reducing the margin on stock-market transactions:

The morning papers carried the announcement that the Federal Reserve Board has just reduced the margin on stock-market transactions from 75 percent to 50 percent, effective Tuesday, February 24. This means that the speculator will need to put only 50 cents on the \$1; he can speculate on credit to the extent of one-half of his purchases of stock.

It should be noted that the Board of Governors actions over the last 2 years has been in the direction of contracting credit in the interest of economic stabilization and as protection against further price rises. The most recent action in line with this policy was taken only a few days ago when the Federal Reserve raised the rediscount rate from 1¼ percent to 2 percent on commercial bank borrowings at the Federal Reserve. The effect of this contraction of credit has been for interest rates to rise, making it more costly for the Government to borrow and refund its debt, and for small-business men and homeowners to operate their business and finance their homes.

But yesterday's action by the Federal Reserve to make it easier for people to speculate on the stock market appear to me to be a reversal of the policy of credit restraint. I hope that it has not been dictated by Wall Street, but recent happenings in the economy since the election suggest that we are following the same pattern of the late 1920's. Now, as then, farm prices are spiraling downward. Now, as then, Wall Street is being encouraged to speculate. We can only hope that these actions will not lead to a similar terrible depression as that which followed so nearly the inauguration of the last Republican President.

In a reply by the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Mr. Martin, to the question propounded to him by a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, of which I was chairman, regarding the role of selective regulation of stock market credit in restraining inflation, he stated:

When stock market credit is expanding it tends to increase the demand for stocks or, more specifically, for stocks that are publicly offered or traded. Hence, expansion in stock market credit tends to raise the price of stocks, although such effect may be partly offset by new flotations that increase the supply.

A second major fact about stock market credit is that in the financial organization of this country changes in this credit are financed largely through the banking system, either through loans to brokers or through loans directly to customers for the purchase and carrying of listed securities. As these loans go up, the deposits of commercial banks also rise, thus increasing the money supply. An increase in the money supply from this source is fundamentally unstable for it tends to be dependent on stock prices and stock market expectations, which are highly volatile.

To the extent that the increased stock market credit is financed by bank credit, it is a factor working to expand the total money supply.

Please notice that Mr. Martin says that if these loans go up, the deposits of commercial banks rise. This is due to created money in the banking system and is very inflationary, everyone agrees.

Mr. Martin further stated:

An increase in stock market credit can sometimes represent a diversion of the flow of funds away from bonds, mortgages, short-term loans, or Government securities. To the extent that it does represent such a diversion, it increases the advantage of those users of capital that can finance by floating stock as against those that cannot. Prominent among the latter are home builders, farmers, small businesses, and the Government (since it issues interest-paying obligations and not stocks).

In summary, it can be said that—except when manpower, facilities, and materials are available to increase physical production—a significant particularized effect of an increase in stock market credit is to divert the flow of funds toward publicly traded stocks and away from other investments such as bonds, mortgages, short-term loans, and Government securities.

In the last paragraph, it will be noticed that Mr. Martin admits that an increase in stock market credit diverts the flow of funds away from Government securities. It should also be considered that this order reducing the margin requirements in February 1953, which makes it harder to sell Government securities, was issued at the very time the Treasury was planning a program for the sale of an issue of long-term securities.

It should be recalled that these answers were made by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Martin, the latter part of 1951.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND LAND GRANT COLLEGES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill will be considered on the floor tomorrow. In the time allotted to me I wish to discuss two items in the bill. One, vocational education, has been reduced considerably, and the other, land grant colleges, has been cut out entirely. I shall attempt to show you the need for sufficient funds to carry on both of these programs, and I hope a sufficient amount will be voted for both.

It is a well known fact that the economic and social well-being of a community, State, or nation is dependent upon the skill, knowledge, and productive capacity of its people. People are not born with skills and knowledge. They must be trained. Education for work is a never-ending process. It must be repeated with each new generation.

Vocational education has played a major role in increasing American production. Skilled workers produce more goods in less time. Other factors have also helped increase production, such as better human relations on the part of management, labor-saving machines, improved quality of raw materials and better management.

Yes, vocational education has helped develop a generation of farmers, business and industrial workers, and homemakers who are more literate than ever before, equipped with better work habits and possessed with more skills and knowledge essential to efficient production and the developing of better homes. America would not be in its present strong position in productive capacity, high living standards, and military preparedness had it not been for our magnificent system of vocational education.

This being true, I hold that a part of the wealth growing out of increased productivity should be plowed back into our public vocational system. This is our surest way to continue progress and keep America strong.

In light of these facts, I have for years supported those measures designed to help with the further development of vocational education as a part of the public school system of this country. As some of you know, I took a leading part in urging the passage of the George-Deen Vocational Education Act, which was passed in 1936. Then in 1947, I supported the George-Barden Act which provides for the further promotion and development of vocational education.

I was not in Congress when the George-Reed Vocational Education Act was passed. We are grateful to Senator GEORGE and other distinguished Georgians who played such an important part in the passage of vocational education legislation. I am also proud of the important role played by my friend and colleague, DANIEL A. REED, of New York, in the passage of this measure.

These measures, together with the original Smith-Hughes Act, which was passed in 1917, have stimulated beyond the dreams of many the development of a system of vocational education which is vital to the security and well-being of this country.

Great progress has been made, but there are still thousands of schools with no programs or inadequate programs of vocational education. We should not be content until every individual who needs it, and can profit by it, has opportunity for vocational training of his choice.

Good education must develop citizens who work as well as play, produce as well as consume, create as well as appreciate. Vocational education for youth and adults helps people to attain these objectives.

The first half of this century witnessed the greatest advance in technology in all history. The second half must see an equal advance in getting the world's work done through people. This is a terrific challenge to vocational education. It is also a challenge to Congress to see that the program is not hampered in such a way as to prevent it from getting the world's work done through people.

The George-Barden Act, which authorizes an appropriation of \$29,300,000 annually, provides for the development of programs of vocational education of less than college grade. It is designed primarily to help those who need assistance most—youth who cannot or do not go to college where opportunities exist for preparing for a profession or vocation at the college level. It is designed to assist the masses who need help most.

I cannot understand why the Appropriations Committee has recommended a cut of \$2,624,391, or about 11 percent, in the appropriation for vocational education. This is the first step in an effort to eventually destroy a program of education that is meaning so much to the youth and adults of our land. This drastic cut certainly would result in eliminating the program in many communities of the Nation and crippling the program everywhere.

I am sure it is not in keeping with the thinking of President Eisenhower to cut vocational education funds or to wipe out funds for land-grant colleges. As evidence of this, I would like to quote from a letter the President wrote last September in which he indicated his keen interest in this phase of education and the need for maintaining and strengthening the program:

OFFICE OF DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
New York, N. Y., September 27, 1952.

Mr. C. M. MILLER,
State Board for Vocational Education,
Topeka, Kans.

DEAR MR. MILLER: I understand you would like to have from me a brief statement which you might use in the October issue of several publications dealing with vocational education. You are free to use the following:

"One of the greatest things about the United States is the fact that it has achieved the highest level of mass education in history. This American system has many unique and valuable phases, among the most important of which are the land grant colleges, the experiment stations, the vocational education program in high schools, the county agent system, and the future farmers and 4-H programs.

"The wealth of the world is created by the work of skilled hands on raw materials. Our magnificent system of vocational education is constantly developing increased understanding of raw materials, and is helping to develop the skilled hands and the clear minds essential to turning those raw materials into useful wealth.

"One thing I like especially about the program is that it calls for genuine understanding and cooperation on the part of Federal, State, and local agencies. Here, the Federal Government is a helpful partner, not an officious boss. That is how it should be."

Sincerely yours,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

It is my understanding that Russia has greatly expanded its program of vocational education in recent years, and that this, at least in part, accounts for

Russia's increased and improved production. Malenkov in his speech last fall indicated that Russia and her communistic satellites would continue to increase production and try to win the cold war by outproducing America and underselling us in the markets of the world. They are using vocational education to step up their productive capacity, and, from the most reliable information we can obtain, they are certainly succeeding in their efforts. It has been reported in the press that the rate of increase of Russian production at the present time is almost twice the rate of increase of production in this country.

To do anything to weaken America's vocational program would be playing into the very hands of Russia. This we must not do.

It would be an act of wisdom to increase aid to vocational education instead of decreasing it. America's strength lies in its people and their ability to produce efficiently goods and services.

Our hope of winning a cold or a hot war is dependent in a large measure on the productive capacity of our people. Vocational education as presently carried on in the public schools of the Nation certainly plays a major role in helping people to acquire skills, technical and scientific knowledge that result in increasing their productive capacity. A cut in these programs is a cut at the very heart of the Nation.

Vocational education has been a great aid to training those in industry and agriculture alike. In my home town of Elberton, Ga., which is often spoken of as the granite center of the United States, we have a full-time granite apprenticeship coordinator who teaches our granite apprentices two nights per week and daily coordinates and correlates their classwork to their training processes on the job.

Livestock is an ideal project for vocational agriculture students and future farmers. They have produced swine, dairy cattle, beef cattle, and poultry in sufficient quantity and high quality to improve greatly the livestock industry of my State and I think all over the country. William Higginbotham, a young boy of Washington, Ga., has a national reputation with his dairy cattle; Bill Williams, of Buena Vista, with his hogs; and Tommy Rainey, of Ellaville, with his beef cattle. I could mention many more, but this is sufficient to illustrate the good results of the training these boys have had.

The Appropriations Committee has recommended no appropriation for land-grant colleges. This is indeed a tragic mistake. The land-grant colleges of the Nation have done much for many. They were started as a result of the Morrill Act which was passed during Abraham Lincoln's administration in 1862. Why withdraw aid from these great institutions of our land? They have done a marvelous job of providing vocational training of college grade and should have the continued support of the Federal Government. The Federal support means more than just the amount of money made available for the land-grant colleges. The same is true for vocational

education of less than college grade. We must see to it that vocational education at the college level and at the level of less than college grade continues to receive financial and moral support from the Federal Government.

We want vocational education to be provided for college students and for the more than 75 percent of our people who cannot or do not attend college. The masses must have vocational training if we are to remain strong. And we must never forget that only the strong can hope to remain free.

Hospital construction is another item which has been drastically cut. If this cut is not restored, hospital construction in my State and throughout the Nation will be severely crippled, and urgently needed hospital projects already approved cannot be built and other projects already started but not completed will be imperiled.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to express my personal appreciation to the gentleman for his fine message in support of the vocational education program, and to state that I feel sure his conclusions about the unhappy effects of such a cut at this stage and the development of that program are sound. I would like to commend the gentleman for his fight in behalf of continued support of this very worthwhile program.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

THE PLIGHT OF THE ARAB REFUGEES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Near East and Africa, I yesterday introduced H. R. 5248. This is a bill which seeks to move forward toward solution one of the most pressing problems of the world, that of the Arab refugees. The plight of these now nearly a million people hangs like a pall over every country in the area and beclouds the whole world. Their condition grows more and more intolerable and the general deterioration is draining them of hope, even of desire. Such an attitude, or should I say lack of attitude and the consequent void it creates, is fertile soil indeed for the subtle inculcation of Communist ideas. The latest reports given this committee are that some 80 percent of these tragic people are in a mood to take part in any uprising which holds possibilities of change. Can one blame them?

Such conditions, Mr. Speaker, are of vital importance to the whole free world, including the United States. Indeed, our position of leadership among the free nations places upon us the responsibility of never ceasing effort to do something to get the situation off dead center.

Extensive as have been the efforts of the United Nations to solve this problem,

they have been of no avail. But the ultimate return to normal living of these hundreds of thousands of human beings is crucial.

In pursuing its study of the situation, the subcommittee has become convinced that there are practical steps that can be taken to give hope to these people and to begin to ameliorate the present conditions—conditions which have brought about a disintegration more and more recognized to be a direct danger to this country and the free world.

The committee is well aware that there are unsolved political problems which appear to be insurmountable hazards to all constructive action. But, Mr. Speaker, we refuse to believe that any problem, however difficult, does not have some solution if a right approach can be found. It is in an effort to find an acceptable approach that the committee is asking the Congress to consider charging the Director of the Mutual Security Agency with the immediate duty of making a short, intensive study of current conditions and possibilities, reporting back within 90 days with recommendations.

In agreeing to the principle of compensatory payments, Israel has made a gesture which may well become the first step toward action, particularly if it is followed by actual payments in the near future. Some of the other countries in the area have long since opened their doors to many thousands in spite of their own economic difficulties. Others are attempting to find ways to absorb thousands more. But there are many obstacles to overcome—some economic, some political. Eventual solution, Mr. Speaker, can and must be found. In the meantime, there are steps that can be taken.

President Eisenhower has sounded a positive note giving direction and leadership to us all. He has made it clear that the United States intends to pay more attention to the Arab States during his administration. After talking with Saudi Arabia's Foreign Minister, the President was quoted as expressing concern over recent "deterioration of relations between the Arab nations and the United States," promising that it would be his "firm purpose to restore confidence and trust." One news article put it this way:

President Eisenhower was outlining a new approach for the Middle East which involves strict fairness and impartiality toward all countries, including Israel.

Evidence of this new approach has been reflected in the regional approach adopted in the Mutual Security Agency bill submitted by the State Department, which is now under scrutiny by the Senate and House committees.

So, Mr. Speaker, in response to the President's declared position, the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Near East and Africa desires to be certain of current situations and conditions in the Near East, hoping that ways of cooperation may be found which will start a constructive program giving new hope to the refugees, allaying the fears of all the countries of this critical area and setting us on the road to better understanding and ultimate peace.

A PROGRAM OF TRADE, NOT AID

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have sent letters to the President of the United States today, also to the Secretary of State, to the Secretary of Commerce, and to the Secretary of Labor. I will read the letter I sent to the President of the United States:

MAY 15, 1953.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have given deep consideration to the question, "Trade or aid to the free nations of the world," currently being considered by the Congress of the United States. I know, Mr. President, that you have an interest, a deep personal interest, in every phase of this program, a deep human interest which I believe motivates your every action. I am, therefore, submitting to you herewith copy of my letters sent to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor asking them to use their good offices to call a conference jointly of representatives of their respective departments, together with representatives of industry and labor, to consider jointly the best possible immediate approach. I am a great believer in the traditional New England system of having selectmen meet, consider a problem and present it then to the town meeting. I believe that such a conference as I here propose would bring together the selectmen most intimately concerned. Whatever help you may give to a broad consideration of the many aspects of this question will, I assure you, be deeply appreciated.

Yours very sincerely,

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

Mrs. John Jacob Rogers.

Trade, not aid, is a currently popular approach to an important phase of our international relations. There are a number of sound and easily understandable reasons for the widespread acceptance of this term. Basically, we want to help other nations and people. Particularly do we want to help them help themselves. That is sound, especially in light of American tradition and in recognition of the history and sensibilities of the people of many of the nations with whom we share our material and spiritual values.

Actually, most of them do not like to have to accept material aid from us. They are proud, freemen. They point to their capacity to produce. They have a production potential which indicates that they could produce by far enough to enable them to develop and maintain a sound national economy, if they had markets for their goods. That "if" is the essence of the problem; their's and ours.

The two most potentially extensive immediate world markets are the United States and Russia. To be sure, as each free nation reestablishes its own sound economy, it in turn becomes a potential merchant and a potential market for its own goods and for the goods of other nations. But at the moment the major markets in which all these countries could sell are Russia and—if we let them—the United States. That "if," as I have said, is the crux of the problem.

If we do not buy the goods of other nations, where else can they sell them ex-

cept to Russia? Yet, if we do admit their goods to our markets, to be sold at a market level based on their production costs, we are placing our own workers' wages and production standards in serious jeopardy. We are placing goods produced by well-paid labor in competition with goods produced by lowly paid labor. The textile industry in my State well illustrates this point. Our textile workers are paid real wages above those paid textile workers in any other country and above those paid even in our own United States. This standard is obtained through a combination of a negotiated wage over and above essential statutory bases. We set a floor for their wages. And I by my vote, helped set that floor. I voted for the Walsh-Healey Act; I voted for the original Wages and Hours Act; I voted for the Bacon Act. I believe in the maintenance of adequate wages and good working conditions. I believe a national floor for wages helps maintain a free competitive industry in which free trade unions could bargain with employers for wages above the statutory base.

Today I want to direct careful consideration to the dilemma the international trade problem poses for us. If foreign textiles are imported into our country to be sold in competition with our textiles, at a lower rate than the actual cost of production is in the United States, then our textile industry cannot survive. Some will view this grave problem entirely in terms of international repercussions. World economic stabilization, I realize, is essential to world peace. World economic stabilization requires an outlet for national production above domestic needs.

However, I am not resigned to a philosophy which accepts defeat and destruction for some as a byproduct of social change and world development. I do not believe that we can morally permit the destruction of the New England textile industry or the New England shoe industry or any other industry in any other State, by the importation of foreign goods produced at low wages and long working hours, without planning to do something to protect the economic, the social, the human interests of the men and women in these industries and their families. Do those who propose what would in effect wipe out certain domestic industries, to build up world trade, at the same time propose a Government subsidy for the industry they are destroying by placing it in competition with the goods produced by poorly paid foreign workers? Do they also propose a new sort of WPA to supplement the workers' pay if the manufacturers cut wages to reduce prices to meet this competition from abroad?

There is another point even more serious to me than the economic losses this program would impose on our workers and our manufacturers. The devastating blow to the dignity and morale of the workers, the psychological effect on employer and employee of removing his sense of security is far more important even than the economic problem, important as that may be.

And yet, even as I say this, I realize that the dignity and morale of the work-

ers in other countries is involved in this problem, too.

I do not here propose a solution. I do, however, suggest an approach.

First. There cannot properly at this time be a question of trade or aid. There is a very complex question of how, where, and when to aid or to trade.

Second. A superficial, sporadic, localized approach to one aspect of the problem at one time cannot have the constructive approach which is vitally essential today.

Third. We cannot morally, as a nation, permit the dislocation or destruction of industry in any field, in any area in our country, lest the grievous harm done thereby to any group of persons may not only expose certain areas to economic and social waste, but may even begin a wave of chaotic events which may endanger our whole national economic security.

A chain reaction to misfortune in one area or one field of enterprise may start a trend toward a serious recession, leading—heaven forbid—to a depression.

Fourth. We cannot ignore the needs of freemen anywhere; especially today, when communism waits with yawning jaws to suck in and devour the least fortunate of men. Our appreciation for sound economic enterprise coupled with our sense of moral responsibility must help us plan for the well-being of all freemen here and afar. However, in our zeal to help freemen and to make men free all over the world, we cannot fail in our duty to our own people, first of all. Actually our ability to help freemen anywhere must be predicated upon keeping our own people free and strong so that they have not only the will, but the capacity to serve their fellow men wherever the need arises.

Fifth. We must not permit the need of freemen anywhere to compel them to look to Russia for temporary relief—and thereby for permanent enslavement. Russia's offer to buy the wares of freemen entices them in their great need, and endangers them—and us.

I propose, therefore, that, as quickly as possible, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor jointly convene a small working conference of representatives of industry and labor to find a way of protecting the interest of our people now, and for the future, while we serve and develop the well-being of all freemen through trade and/or aid, whichever, whenever it is best.

WILL TITO GO BACK TO THE KREMLIN?

Mr. CRETTELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KIRSTEN] be given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRSTEN of Wisconsin. Tito, of Yugoslavia, is likely to make his peace with the Kremlin in the very near future.

The recent meetings of the envoys of Tito with Soviet agents indicate that a rapprochement is imminent. If Tito is

back in the counsels of the Kremlin, how great will have been the hoax perpetrated by the pro-Tito apologists. The millions of dollars of American aid sent to Tito will redound to the benefit of the Soviets.

This means that the guns and tanks and planes that we have sent to Tito would be turned against us and would have to be matched by further guns and tanks and planes in Western Europe.

It is becoming increasingly clear that aid to the Yugoslav Communist dictator never had a reasonable chance of changing his black heart and all the while the people of Yugoslavia have continued to suffer under the heel of the Tito type of communism and they will be brought back again under the police state tyranny of the Kremlin. How naive are those American policymakers who would shape our foreign policy on the Tito pattern—Tito, of Yugoslavia, or Mao Tse-tung, of China, or any other Communist dictator in the Soviet sphere.

Incidentally, the same people that have been lately promoting Tito were the ones who favored sending arms to the "agrarian reformer" Mao Tse-tung who is now murdering American boys.

It is possible, of course, that Malenkov and Tito would not let their real alliance be fully known to the Western World in order that Tito might still seek to get aid from the United States. But the mere willingness on the part of Tito now to negotiate with the Kremlin should be enough to convince American policymakers that no trust can be put in a Communist dictator of any nationality.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WAINWRIGHT.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a letter for Admiral Boone regarding an exhibition of prosthetic appliances.

Mr. ARENDS and to include four short editorials.

Mr. JACKSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JACKSON and to include an article which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$196.

Mr. LANE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. SULLIVAN and to include a statement she made before the Library Subcommittee and an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. McCormack) and to include an editorial.

Mr. MCCORMACK in two instances; to include in one a letter from the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and in the other an article by James Morgan appearing in last Sunday's Globe.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. BAKER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN and to include an article.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a statement by the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers before the Committee on Ways and Means, at an estimated cost of \$399.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. McCormack) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VELDE.

Mr. D'EWTART and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DURHAM.

Mr. EVINS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHEPPARD (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California.)

Mr. BUSBEY and to include a resolution of the Laundry Workers' International Union, AFL.

Mr. O'KONSKI in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLT.

Mr. WILSON of California.

Mr. MULTER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHENCK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. WHITTEN) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. WHITTEN) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POLK to include in his remarks in Committee of the Whole two short statistical tables on soil-conservation practices carried out on Ohio farms under the agricultural program in 1951.

Mr. HILL to include some tables in his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CRETELLA and to include resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. PATTEN, for the rest of the week, on account of atom test.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2277. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, so as to change the name of such association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 20, 1953, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

702. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize and finance a program of public works construction for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

703. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to expedite the payment by the Comptroller General of judgments rendered by the district courts and the Court of Claims against the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

704. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have sole authority to regulate the vacation periods and annual leave of absence of certain school officers and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia,' approved March 5, 1953"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

705. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the Department of the Interior on the lower Nueces River project, Texas, prepared under authority of the Federal reclamation laws, pursuant to the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

706. A letter from the secretary, the American Society of International Law, transmitting the annual audit by a certified public accountant of the financial transactions of the said society for the year ended December 31, 1952, pursuant to section 9 of the act of September 20, 1950, 64 Stat. 869; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

707. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

708. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

709. A letter from the Federal Security Administrator, transmitting the 13th Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to section 201 (b) of the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 237. Resolution extending greetings to the Republic of Haiti on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the creation of its national flag; without amendment (Rept. No. 428). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4485. A bill to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to publication of partnerships; without amendment (Rept. No. 432). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2969. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property in Prince Georges County, Md., acquired as a site for the National Training School for Girls; without amendment (Rept. No. 433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4484. A bill to amend section 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of assets of a decedent's estate for funeral expenses; without amendment (Rept. No. 434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4486. A bill to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to forcible entry and detainer; without amendment (Rept. No. 435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4487. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as further amended by an act of April 19, 1920 (title 20, ch. 1, sec. 116, D. C. Code, 1951), relating to continuing decedent's business; without amendment (Rept. No. 436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4550. A bill to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property; without amendment (Rept. No. 437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4939. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix certain licensing and registration fees; with amendment (Rept. No. 438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4940. A bill to provide for the redemption of District of Columbia tax stamps; without amendment (Rept. No. 439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3087. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3796. A bill relating to the incorporation of the Columbus University of Washington, D. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4229. A bill to change the name of the Polycultural Institution of America to Polycultural University of America, to grant a congressional charter to such university, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 5269. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 5270. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be an ex officio member of the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 5271. A bill to permit payment of certain cost-of-living allowances outside the continental United States at rates in excess of 25 percent of the rate of basic compensation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 5272. A bill to provide for a review by the Court of Military Appeals in certain cases in which relief pursuant to section 12 of the act of May 5, 1950 (64 Stat. 147) was denied by The Judge Advocate General of any of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 5273. A bill to repeal the act of July 27, 1950, so as to terminate the President's authority to extend enlistments in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5274. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by the addition of a new section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5275. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 5276. A bill relating to the deduction for depreciation in the case of land containing peat, muck, and other organic soils which wear out or is subject to exhaustion due to oxidation, while being used for agricultural or horticultural purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. R. 5277. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall investigate and report upon the advisability of establishing a national monument and national cemetery on the site of the old Fort Wallace Post Cemetery, Kans.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. Res. 240. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the subsidies paid by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 241. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 240; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. Res. 242. Resolution to amend Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting legislative action necessary to complete a partially completed highway from the city of Hoquiam in Grays Harbor County and following the shore of the Pacific Ocean to a junction with the Olympic Loop Highway in the vicinity of Queets; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting action as may be necessary to make known to the public the elevation of the theoretical maximum high-water level of the pool behind the proposed John Day Dam and the probable year of starting construction; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting passage of necessary legislation, and the Federal Security Administrator to make the necessary regulations, to exempt a certain percentage of the earnings of any dependent children in respect to whom aid is being paid, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 5278. A bill for the relief of Arturo Tarzia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5279. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Paniccioli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5280. A bill for the relief of Ciro Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5281. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 5282. A bill for the relief of Francesco Sebastiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 5283. A bill for the relief of Charles Sacco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5284. A bill for the relief of Agostino Giampoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 5285. A bill for the relief of Edward Gordon, Morton Gordon, John J. Dahill, Esteban Melendez, Jean Garcia, Marie Flynn, Carmen Rodriguez, and 62 Lenox Ave. Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 5286. A bill for the relief of Wajih Kassees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 5287. A bill for the relief of Maximilian Paschkus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5288. A bill for the relief of Jacob Helman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5289. A bill for the relief of Herman Landau, Mrs. Szerena Landau, and Erwin Landau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5290. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ettil Yahoubian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5291. A bill for the relief of Dieran Yahoubian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD (by request):

H. R. 5292. A bill for the relief of Alexander and Victoria Lashkareff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5293. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence M. Augustine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 5294. A bill for the relief of Amante Rongetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

268. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of Miss Mary L. Rector, of Pawtucket, R. I., and 76 others relative to the advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

269. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of 35 residents of Spokane County, Wash., for favorable consideration and enactment of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

270. By Mr. LESINSKI: Resolution of the Ecorse Aerie, No. 2812, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Ecorse, Mich., endorsing H. R. 4308, authorizing the Postmaster General to provide for the use of special canceling stamps or postmarking dies bearing the words "In God We Trust" for use in first- and second-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

271. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Earl V. Cates, president, Business Men's League of United States, Chicago, Ill., relative to no further delay in appropriating money for the Calumet Harbor and Sag Channel project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

272. Also, petition of Office of United States Government Agency's Employee and President-in-exile of the San Juan, P. R., post office, relative to the claims of approximately 26 persons of the Post Office Custodial Service Employees Association, concerning charges preferred before the United States Civil Service Commission against the majority of the San Juan, P. R., Post Office-Custodial Service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 1953

(Legislative day of Friday, May 15, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. Joseph Francis Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, Carrollton Manor, Frederick, Md., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Creator of the Universe, look down with favor upon the Presiding Officer of this Senate and let the light of Thy countenance shine brightly upon all the Members of the Congress.

Grant to Thy children, in an hour of crisis, Thy most powerful graces so that, with enlightened minds and firm wills,

they may achieve Thy gracious purposes for the salvation and progress of this troubled world.

On this day, sacred in the history of a sister republic, Cuba, and in this year, dedicated to the memory of a noble-hearted apostle of freedom, José Martí, vouchsafe to the peoples of all the American Republics as well as to their leaders and legislators the special blessings that are needed to preserve and advance human dignity throughout the hemisphere.

Rekindle the fires of liberty everywhere, dear Saviour, with the torch of Thy divine love.

We pray for these gifts in the name of our Redeemer, who is Christ, the Son of God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 19, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1448) to amend the act of June 25, 1942, relating to the making of photographs and sketches of properties of the Military Establishment, to continue in effect the provisions thereof until 6 months after the present national emergency, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 35. An act to provide for the repair and rehabilitation of public airports damaged by the armed services during the present national emergency, to extend beyond June 30, 1953, the availability of previous appropriations for payment of claims under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, and for other purposes; and

S. 1550. An act to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 307. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and op-

erate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.;"

H. R. 665. An act for the relief of N. A. G. L. Moerings, Mrs. Bertha Johanna Krabenbrink Moerings, and Lambertus Karel Aloysius Josef Moerings;

H. R. 685. An act for the relief of Walter Carl Sander;

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of Porfirio Punciano Vila, Tatiana Abatooroff Vila, Porfirio P. Vila, Jr., Anne Marie Vila, and Josephine Anne Vila;

H. R. 765. An act for the relief of Tien Koo Chen;

H. R. 779. An act for the relief of Ida Baghdassarian;

H. R. 781. An act for the relief of Johanna C. Willemsen;

H. R. 833. An act for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung;

H. R. 847. An act for the relief of Robert J. Rickards, Conception Sotelo Rickards, and Walter John Rickards;

H. R. 869. An act for the relief of Masuko Oshima;

H. R. 978. An act for the relief of Harue Fukushima;

H. R. 1143. An act for the relief of Mary Francina Marconi, Fernanda Guzzi, Anna Ferraro, Mary Laudano, and Julia Pisano;

H. R. 1219. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 1330. An act for the relief of Mrs. Liane Lieu and her son, Peter Lieu;

H. R. 1345. An act for the relief of John Lampropoulos;

H. R. 1434. An act to amend the act of February 24, 1925, incorporating the American War Mothers;

H. R. 1561. An act authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration (in Johnson City, Tenn.) to the State of Tennessee;

H. R. 1730. An act to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation;

H. R. 1756. An act for the relief of Eugene de Thassy;

H. R. 1815. An act to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes;

H. R. 1886. An act for the relief of Paul Myung Ha Chung;

H. R. 1963. An act for the relief of Annelese Schillings;

H. R. 2160. An act for the relief of Clementina Ferrara, Maria Garofalo, Rosetta Savino, Maria Serra, Albina Zamunner, and Fedora Gazzarrini;

H. R. 2226. An act to repeal the provision of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to pay of civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska;

H. R. 2312. An act to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold";

H. R. 2313. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of March 27, 1942, as extended, relating to the inspection and audit of plants, books, and records of defense contractors, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter;

H. R. 2319. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective Departments, and for other purposes;